DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 446 PS 023 815

AUTHOR Powney, Janet; And Others
TITLE Understanding Values Education in the Primary School. The Scottish Council for Research in Education Research Report Series.
INSTITUTION Scottish Council for Research in Education, Edinburgh.
SPONS AGENCY Gordon Cook Foundation (Scotland).
REPORT NO ISBN-1-86003-013-0; SCRE-131; SCRE-RR-64
PUB DATE Sep 95
NOTE 103p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Scottish Council for Research in Education, 15 St. John Street, Edinburgh, EH8 8JR, Scotland, United Kingdom (9 British Pounds).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *Ethical Instruction; Family School Relationship; Foreign Countries; Hidden Curriculum; *Ideology; *Moral Values; Parent Role; School Role; Values; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS *Moral Education; *Scotland

ABSTRACT

This study of values education was conducted in primary schools in Scotland between April 1993 and April 1995. The study: (1) explored the kinds of values implicitly and explicitly taught; (2) investigated teachers', pupils', and parents' perceptions of values education; (3) explored the ways value education occurs; and (4) sought to raise awareness of these ways. Data collection consisted of initial in-depth studies of values education in five primary schools and a postal survey with teachers and headteachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools. The in-depth studies included interviews and discussions with teachers and administrators, classroom observations, and analysis of student writings. The postal survey was designed to explore issues emerging from the in-depth studies. Results include the following: (1) there was considerable consensus among school staff over the values they wished to impart upon their students; (2) most staff and parents saw values education as being the primary responsibility of the parents, not the school; (3) headteachers generally saw it as their role to establish a policy and tone for values education; and (4) values were defined in broad terms, including caring, self-esteem, cooperation, respect, and consideration. (Contains 84 references and a technical appendix describing methodology.) (JW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 389 446

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Understanding Values Education in the Primary School

Janet Powney
Mairi-Ann Cullen
Ursula Schlapp
Peter Glissov
Margaret Johnstone
Pamela Munn

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Wake
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 023815

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Understanding Values Education in the Primary School

Janet Powney
Mairi-Ann Cullen
Ursula Schlapp
Peter Glissov
Margaret Johnstone
Pamela Munn

The Scottish Council for Research in Education

SCRE Research Report No 64

SCRE Publication 131

ISBN 1 86003 013 0

Copyright © 1995 The Scottish Council for Research in Education

First published September 1995

A report arising from a project commissioned by the Gordon Cook Foundation and carried out between April 1993 and April 1995 by the Scottish Council for Research in Education.

The views expressed are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Scottish Council for Research in Education or the Gordon Cook Foundation.

Printed and bound by The Scottish Council for Research in Education, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR.

Contents

		Page
Acknowledgements		**vi**
Summary		**vii**
THE PROJECT		
1	**Introduction and Context**	**1**
	Introduction	1
	Context	1
	What is a value?	2
	Schools and values	5
2	**Research Approach**	**8**
	Research aims	8
	The research questions	8
	Research strategy	9
	The research team	12
STUDIES IN SCHOOLS		
3	**In the classroom**	**13**
	The kinds of values fostered	13
	Rationales	15
	Methods	16
	Part of the job, part of me	17
	Evaluating success	17
4	**In the school**	**19**
	Values for all the pupils	19
	Rationales in a school context	20
	Involving pupils in promoting school values	22
	Involving teachers in promoting school values	23
	Values and discipline	25
	Evaluating success	26
5	**Pupils' perspectives on values**	**28**
	Pupils and classroom values: the group interviews	29
	Writing about values in the classroom	30

Reasons, explanations and connections 31
Useful and good values 33
In the playground 34
Playground rules and pupil reactions 36
Another kind of value 37
Conclusion 38
Summary of study school findings 38

THE SURVEY

6 Survey findings: what the staff say 41
Introduction 41
Which values are fostered in the school? 41
Which values are fostered in the classroom? 42
Why are these values important? 44
Why is 'values education' important? 46
How are these values fostered? 47
Where are these values fostered? 49
Do the pupils acquire these values? 50
Is there an agreed values stance within schools? 51
How has agreement been reached? 52
Is agreement shared with parents and community? 55
Summary of survey findings 57

TOWARDS MORE UNDERSTANDING

7 Reflections 59
Are values fostered at school relevant to other aspects of life? 59
Can values education be planned? 59
How can members of a school cope with conflicting values? 60
How can values education be monitored and evaluated? 60
What contribution do parents make to values education? 61
Can there be a more precise language for discussing values? 61

8 In conclusion 62
Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values? 63
Staff perceptions of values 64
Fostering values 66
Complexities of researching values 67
Concluding comments 70

Bibliography 72

Appendix

The Advisory Committee 77

Technical Appendix 78

Introduction 78

Study schools methods 78

Survey methods 83

Tables

4.1 Headteachers' views of key school value(s) 21
4.2 Headteachers' responses to: Do teachers in your school agree about whole school values? 24
5.2 Pupil's playground expectations in the five case study schools 35
5.3 Boys' and girls' comments on fighting 36-37
6.1 Values most often identified as being stressed within the school 42
6.2 Values fostered by teachers in their classrooms 43
6.3 Why is each of these values important for your pupils? 44
6.4 Reasons for values education being important 46
6.5 In what ways do adults in the school demonstrate and foster these values? 47
6.6 Methods teachers use to foster values 48
6.7 Where do you think pupils learn most about values in your school? 49
6.8 Ways teachers judge success of fostering of values 50
6.9 How teachers and headteachers tell pupils are aware of school values? 51
6.10 How has an agreed values stance developed? 52
6.11 Which of these have most affected your views of values education? 53
6.12 Headteachers' role in developing values education 54
6.13 Types of contact between class teachers and parents 55
6.14 Ways schools involve parents in values education 56

Tables in Appendix

A.1 Phases of the pupil group interviews 80
A.2 The study schools 81
A.3 State primaries in Scotland and study samples by size and denomination 84
A.4 Study sample and schools responding by size and denomination 85
A.5 Regional spread of survey returns (number in sample shown in brackets) 86
A.6 Numbers of questionnaires returned 87
A.7 Teacher and HT numbers by gender 88
A.8 Number of headteachers by age-band 88
A.9 Number of teachers by age-band 88
A.10 List of all values identified as being stressed within schools, with numbers of teachers and headteachers identifying each 89-90

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the teachers and other staff who participated in this research and who set aside time to talk or write about values education. We would also like to thank the pupils who spoke to us and who wrote for us, and of course their parents, who agreed to be interviewed.

The Advisory Committee provided consistently helpful and stimulating comments on the work and this report. Our thanks are owed to all the members and to Professor Marvin Beckovitz who also made constructive suggestions at the final stages.

Finally, we thank the trustees of the Gordon Cook Foundation, without whose support and enthusiasm this research would not have been possible.

Summary

This study of values education was commissioned from the Scottish Council for Research in Education by the Gordon Cook Foundation, an educational charitable trust. The main aim of the Gordon Cook Foundation is to promote values education throughout the United Kingdom. The research was carried out in primary schools in Scotland between April 1993 and April 1995 in order to:

- explore the kinds of values currently being taught, explicitly or implicitly in primary schools in Scotland
- investigate teachers', pupils and parents' perceptions of values education
- explore the ways in which values education takes place
- raise awareness of the ways in which values education takes place.

Values education has in this study been taken to mean all aspects of the process by which teachers (and other adults) transmit values to pupils. From reading the literature in the field of values, it became clear that:

- values include, but go beyond, the religious and moral areas of belief; 'values' refers also to other aspects of how our lives are sustained, organised and experienced
- values may engage our cognition, emotions and behaviour
- values may be expressed at two different levels: fundamental and contextual.

Methods of collecting data ensured that the findings of this study were grounded in the views of the teachers and pupils. Two main approaches to data collection were used: initial in-depth studies of values education in five primary schools, followed by a postal survey with teachers and headteachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools to explore the issues emerging from the in-depth studies.

The five study schools were in different areas of Scotland and ranged in size from 30 to 450 pupils. In these schools information was gathered from staff, pupils, parents and documents, by formal and less formal interviews and discussions, observations and analysis of pupils' written materials.

The survey questionnaire was sent to a sample of teachers (of P1, P4 and P7 pupils) and headteachers in 10% of Scottish primary schools. The sample included Catholic and non-denominational schools from the state sector, and independent schools, and covered schools of different sizes from all regions of Scotland. There was a response rate of around 40%, in which all types of schools from the sample were represented.

■ Findings

Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values?

- In the study schools and survey schools, there was considerable consensus among the staff over the values they were fostering with their pupils.
- Most staff felt that in general the parents and carers of their pupils knew of, and shared, the values being fostered in class and school. However, parents who were interviewed seemed to have a knowledge of values education which was limited to the assumption that: 'the school carries on what we began'.
- Most staff and parents saw the ultimate responsibility for pupils' development of values as lying with the parents, not the school.

Staff perceptions of values

- The values most often identified by staff were expressed in broad, overlapping terms, such as caring, consideration and respect for others, self-esteem, co-operation, good manners and work.
- The values split into two types: those seen as relevant to the individual (eg work habits, self-discipline, patience, honesty) and those seen as socially cohesive (sharing, kindness, co-operation, tolerance). This demarcation is a little blurred in that values relevant for the individual are relevant because of '...helping [the pupil] fit into society.'
- Teachers and headteachers gave rationales for values education and the fostering of specific values ranging from minimising disruption and maximising learning in the classroom, to inculcation of values for life.

Fostering values

- The headteachers generally saw it as their role to set the tone for values in the school and ensure a policy of values education.
- Teachers regarded fostering values as part of their job, and integral to what went on in the classroom.
- Methods identified by the survey respondents as being used for demonstrating and fostering values in their schools, were based more on informal approaches and the hidden curriculum than on formal methods. Where a teaching scheme was specified this was usually religious and moral education with occasional mention of personal and social development, environmental studies, health education and topic work.
- In the study schools, some teachers took a largely reactive approach to values fostering, while others were more proactive in their approach, creating as well as seizing occasions. Where there was debate and discussion as part of values education, this focused on the rationales for values (eg why should we be kind?) rather than on consideration of what values to hold.
- From the survey it emerged that both teachers and headteachers felt most values education in school happens in the classroom, although places such as playground and dinner hall were also identified. Home and community were seen as important too, perhaps more influential than school.
- In talking of how they judge the success of their fostering of values, staff focused mainly on pupil behaviour.

- Evaluating success tends to be rather *ad hoc*, collecting examples and impressions, mostly from within the classroom.
- Teachers and headteachers seem confident overall that pupils are aware of the values the school is attempting to foster, even if they do not always try or succeed in holding to them.

Themes and reflections

Behaviour, feelings and cognition were three aspects of values identified as part of the researchers' conceptual framework. Behaviour seems so central to primary teachers' understanding of values that they often list certain types of behaviour as 'values'. Whilst terms that teachers use such as 'caring' and 'consideration' are open to different interpretations, they certainly convey a sense of engaging feelings as well as simply displaying appropriate behaviours.

The cognitive dimension of values seems rather less recognised or consciously addressed by teachers as far as the findings of this research indicate. Teachers appear to spend little time with their pupils considering the processes involved in acquiring knowledge and understanding and reaching a personal values stance.

There was little indication that discussing the development of values was considered as part of the staff's development of a school values stance either. Perhaps this is a consequence of the linguistic difficulties facing teachers if they attempt to address these issues. There is not an established discourse for values education and no clear definition in much of the language used about values. Consequently the terms used can be very broad and even approach clichés. However, an important factor may also be the considerable homogeneity of background and experience of Scottish primary school staff.

The cognitive aspect of values could also be taken to include specific subject content. Our findings indicated that whilst moral, primary staff of and for some religious, values might form the starting point for understanding of the scope of values education, their thinking generally went beyond this. Even in the Catholic schools an overtly religious approach was not the only, or necessarily the main, channel for fostering values. A purely moral stance was also rarely expressed, meaning the assertion that such and such is a value simply because it is 'right' or 'good'. Other subject areas, notably environmental issues such as conservation, were considered to be part of values education by some of our respondents. However, there appeared to be quite a narrow understanding of what 'values education' includes, since the value of learning was so rarely mentioned, while learning must surely be something that teachers themselves do value.

There certainly seems to be a degree of consensus among staff and parents over a core set of broad values fostered in primary schools across Scotland, although this shared stance seems to be based largely on assumptions rather than on explicit communication about values. While schools have an important role in all aspects of children's education, informants agreed that parents are ultimately responsible for the development of their young children's values. This raises questions beyond the scope of this research but which need to be addressed. These include issues about how parents, parent teacher groups and school boards can participate in developing a school's values education policy and practices.

The primary purpose of schools is to enable children to learn. Teachers and headteachers therefore tend to emphasise values which are necessary to operate successfully as a member of a class or school with externally determined goals. To what extent is values education in school relevant to life in the world beyond?

The researchers conclude that much of what is currently happening in values education in Scottish primary schools seems to be taken for granted and not explicitly discussed but this may no longer be enough in the context of changes in Scottish society together with the ever increasing ability to communicate world wide, which moves us towards a more diverse community.

This study has taken a first step towards increasing understanding of what must be one of the most difficult areas of educational enquiry. We have only been able to skim the surface; the survey in particular has given us insight only into what practitioners think and say about values education, not what they are actually doing. Nonetheless, it is hoped that this research will provide a springboard for further thinking about and development of values education.

The report

This report is organised in four sections.

The first section of the report provides some background to this study of values education in Scottish primary schools. Chapter 1—Context—provides a brief introduction to the theoretical and educational context in which this study took place. Chapter 2—Research approach—describes the approach and methods used in collecting information for this research.

Section Two of the report presents the findings from the in-depth studies in schools. Each of the three chapters takes a different focus which together provide some sense of life in the classroom and in these schools. Chapter 3—In the classroom – is largely concerned with the teachers' views on values and values education. Chapter 4—In the school – provides a broader view from the headteachers' perspective. Chapter 5—Pupils' perspectives and values – presents the information collected from the pupils through interviews and a written task. This section concludes with a summary of the findings from the in-depth studies.

Section Three of the report comprises a single chapter which presents detailed findings from the survey of teachers and headteachers carried out in the latter phase of data collection. The survey focused on the values individual teachers and the whole staff thought important and how and where these values might be agreed and fostered.

The final section of the report 'Towards more understanding' brings together the two phases of the project, considers what the research has added to our understanding of values education in Scottish primary schools. It also highlights some of the difficulties and ambiguities entailed in values education and in researching it. Chapter 7—Reflections—highlights what we see as the key issues raised by this study. Chapter 8—In conclusion—draws together the findings from the case studies and survey in discussing four major themes which emerged from the research: schools as a context for values education; staff perceptions of values; fostering values; and complexities of researching values.

1 Introduction and context

> Those of us concerned with values education should be asking questions about the values which are conveyed by, or through the services of, teachers in schools. There are three principal ways in which schools transmit values: through the curriculum (both formal and informal); through the so-called hidden curriculum; and through the personal interaction between teachers and their pupils. In respect of each of these aspects of schooling, we should be asking questions, encouraging and supporting research studies and experiments, and promoting discussion. We should engage in critical scrutiny to the extent that we not only challenge underlying assumptions but also inform and revitalise teachers' thinking. (Gatherer, 1991)

Introduction

This study of values education was commissioned from the Scottish Council for Research in Education by the Gordon Cook Foundation, an educational charitable trust. The main aim of the Gordon Cook Foundation is to promote values education throughout the United Kingdom. The research was carried out in primary schools in Scotland between April 1993 and April 1995 in order to:

- explore the kinds of values currently being taught, explicitly or implicitly in primary schools in Scotland
- investigate teachers', pupils' and parents' perceptions of values education
- explore the ways in which values education takes place
- raise awareness of the ways in which values education takes place.

Context

Any understanding of the values being fostered in schools needs to be placed in the context of the society in which the school is located and in which the pupils must live their lives. The context for this study, in the broadest of terms, is the world in the 1990s. In particular it is the western world, Europe, the United Kingdom, and most specifically Scotland. The views of the people who contributed to this study have been formed and are influenced by this context, and so too are those of the researchers.

In the context of schooling, values education includes values implicit in the very existence of compulsory education. Furthermore, the acceptance of responsibility by the state for the schooling of the vast majority of young people in the United Kingdom up to at least the age of sixteen appears to place some value or values on the process of schooling. How education is interpreted and promoted is also a reflection of society's values. Since the majority of our children go through the school system, that system is necessarily involved in their socialisation and thus in the creation of our future society. Given that there are different views about what that future society should be like, it is desirable that the aims and purposes of schooling should be debated, contested, justified.

In the main, recent debate about the purposes of schooling concentrated on two areas: academic purposes on the one hand, and socialisation purposes on the other. The academic

purposes of schools are contested, for example, in relation to assessment, to accountability, and to value added approaches to school evaluation. These are all issues discussed under the rubric of effective schools. The contribution made by schools to the socialisation of the child is not a new issue, but concerns about the apparent failure of schooling to influence and modify children's behaviour flared up in the wake of the Jamie Bulger murder case. Values and the role of the school are rarely absent from media accounts of a generation of video and computer game 'junkies' or from articles on health issues to do with drugs, AIDS or children's diet. Our schools are supposed to produce 'good' children, both in academic terms and in terms of the values children hold. In Scotland, the 5-14 Development Programme contains explicit references to values in various of its documents, and the performance indicators published by HM Inspectors in 1992 to support school development Planning include a set of ethos indicators. Similar initiatives in other parts of Britain include the institution of a National Curriculum and national testing, the requirement to publish school results, and the setting up of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). The call sounded by former Education Minister, John Patten, for schools to 'teach values and a can-do attitude to life' (DFE, 4/1/94) clearly indicated that values are part of the agenda for education.

This is the political and public context within which this research on values education has taken place. In the educational arena in Scotland there has also been considerable emphasis recently on research and development on specific topics such as discipline (eg Johnstone and Munn, 1992) and bullying (eg Johnstone, Munn and Edwards, 1991). Now the focus is broadening into areas such as ethos, and values.

The aim of this study is to set a baseline for any development work in relation to values education, by gaining an understanding of the current situation in primary schools in Scotland.

What is a value?

Before starting on a project aimed at gaining an understanding of values education, we needed to understand what we meant by values and by values education. Our intention was to leave ourselves open to the definitions offered by those in schools, yet to obtain these definitions we had at times to ask direct questions. Furthermore, to help make sense of the definitions offered we had to know what a value might be and how values education could be carried out. The conceptualisation of values derived from our study of the literature has provided a framework for the research.

Our conceptual framework has three parts:

- values include, but go beyond, the religious and moral areas of belief; 'values' refer also to other aspects of how our lives are sustained, organised and experienced
- values may engage our cognition, emotions and behaviour
- values may be expressed at two different levels: fundamental and contextual.

The theoretical background from which this framework was derived is briefly outlined below. This is followed by a consideration of how this framework helps in understanding Scottish primary schools in the 1990s as a context for values education.

Areas of belief

The term 'values education' has in the past been used synonymously with moral and religious education (eg Beck, 1971). More recently there has been a trend towards a

broader definition of values. Berkowitz (1995), working from the ideas of Turiel (1983), identifies three domains of social knowledge in each of which values may be held: social-conventional, personal and moral. Values relating to social customs and norms may vary from one social context or group to another (they are alterable and non-universal), and some values may depend purely on personal issues such as taste. Moral values, which are Berkowitz's (1995) main focus, are by contrast:

> effectively laden beliefs concerning the rightness and wrongness of matters which are intrinsically potentially harmful and are universal and unalterable in their prescriptivety.

Rodger (1992) also recognises a broader view of values. He argues that it is:

> generally true that the development of sensitivity to a wide range of values is a necessary aspect of the maturely moral life. ... To respect and care about others includes respecting and caring about the main concerns in their lives.

This research looked at, but also beyond, religious and moral education and personal and social development. We also wanted to find out about the values that permeate other areas of the overt curriculum and the values that are fostered through the hidden curriculum (relationships within school, the ways activities are organised, who gets a say, ethos) and the informal curriculum.

Cognition, emotions and behaviour

The second aspect of our conceptual framework arose out of the roles played by three different aspects of learning both in values acquisition and in the demonstration of acquired values:

- cognition or knowledge and understanding
- emotions, feelings or attitudes
- behaviour or skills.

Values are more than simply beliefs. Irwin (1988) notes that we tend to assume that holding a particular value ('believing in'), for example honesty, implies appropriate behaviour. This has sometimes been assumed to indicate a straightforward link between values and behaviour.

But the relationship is not simple. Behaviour is conditioned by the conventions of different settings and groups. Sometimes we will not act in accordance with a value we hold because of circumstances: sometimes we will act in accordance with a value we do not hold because of circumstances. Therefore, as Pring (1984) suggests, any account of values should recognise the importance of the connection between behaviour and its social context. Straughan (1989) argues that there is a conflict between two different reasons for action: justificatory reasons, derived from values, and motivational reasons, derived from wants. Another way of looking at this relationship is stressed by Balson (1992). He focuses on the role of feelings as the necessary bridge between believing in something as worthwhile, as being a value, and acting on that belief.

Hill (1991) asserts that holding a value involves believing in it as an idea related to worth or obligation (knowing); believing in it with a degree of intensity (feeling); and, therefore, having a disposition to act consistently with it (doing). While the precise relationship between knowing, feeling and doing may be unclear, and may change

according to circumstances, thinking about values as engaging these three elements is a helpful concept, and one which is important if we are interested in how values are acquired.

Levels

The third aspect of our conceptual framework is that values are expressed at two different levels, fundamental, and contextual. Fundamental values may be thought of as in some sense universal, while contextual values inform specific behaviours within particular circumstances. There is some disagreement about whether fundamental values can be agreed on in a society as complex, pluralistic and stratified as ours. Those who argue for the existence of fundamental values do this in one of two ways: either by citing shared humanity or by asserting moral right.

Some, like Robinson (1991), simply cite our common human nature as the basis for shared fundamental values, but a simple assertion of shared fundamental values stemming from our common humanity cannot explain inhumane behaviour (hatred, cruelty, murder). Perhaps a more realistic outlook is that of Berlin (1991) who proposes that:

> The best that can be done as a general rule is to maintain a precarious equilibrium that will prevent the occurrence of desperate situations, of intolerable choices . . .

Because morals have to do with the way we ought to act towards each other, moral arguments can be used as the basis for claims that fundamental values exist which are 'fitted and adapted to the optimum flourishing of human beings' (Almond, 1991, p2). However, as soon as one goes beyond thinking of humans in terms of a shared human nature and begins to think of humans in terms of the political, racial, cultural, gender and other groupings which exist in the world, one is forced to move on from fundamental values which, in theory, transcend such divisions and consider values at the contextual level.

This contextual level of values generates much controversy. Cole (1991), for example, argues that values which are regarded as fundamental and shared by all in virtue of our common humanity are those of the lowest common denominator. He suggests that views about what best promotes human welfare have to be argued for, not in the *moral* area of belief, which he finds too abstract, but in the *political*. He treats as irrelevant the assertion of fundamental shared moral values but sees as vital the practice of values within the sectional groupings that make up human societies, and then the issue of values conflict begins to emerge. Once we move out of the moral area of belief and away from the abstract fundamental level to the complex business of living, even an ardent advocate of universal morals such as Singh (1991) admits:

> Of course, conceptions of justice, equality, fairness, and allegiance to such conceptions will differ from group to group, who from time to time use them to express rival and incompatible social ideals . . .

Values conflict

Many writers, such as Raths *et al* (1978) and Rose (1956), have pointed out that values conflict may exist not only at the theoretical level but also within an individual, a group or a society. This being so, how is such conflict tolerated? In society this depends on the political values of the dominant group. In a democratic society, as Singh (1991) and Jordan (1991) have argued, conflict can be accommodated in social and political institutions through debate, comparison, contrast and toleration. In societies where political institutions

operate according to one religious faith, or indeed, one totalitarian ideology, conflicting values within that society are not tolerated and are dealt with by repression. Within an individual, the way in which value conflicts are resolved involves a complex process. As Raths *et al* (1978) have argued:

> ...because values are a part of everyday living, they operate in very complex circumstances and usually involve more than simple extremes of right and wrong, good or bad, true or false. The conditions under which behaviour is guided, in which values work, typically involves conflicting demands, a weighing and a balancing, and finally an action that reflects a multitude of forces.

This takes us back to the complex interaction between the three elements of holding a value: cognition, emotions and behaviour.

In the next section we consider how the threefold conceptual framework relates to current educational policy in relation to values.

Schools and values

In the state education system, recent legislation has recognised a place for values in the curriculum. The Education Reform Act (ERA) of 1988 stipulated that the curriculum should: 'promote the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society'. Values education is clearly embedded in such a curriculum. This is delivered in England, Wales and Northern Ireland through the National Curriculum as mediated by the appropriate curriculum and assessment councils.

In Scotland, the position is a little different. The Scottish response to the debate about schooling has been the 5-14 Development Programme launched in 1988. Based on ideas of current best practice, the Development Programme evolved out of discussion and consultation and is being introduced gradually into schools. There are five curriculum areas relevant to the primary school: English language, mathematics, environmental studies, expressive arts, and religious and moral education. The existence of an area labelled Religious and Moral Education has not meant that values are ignored elsewhere. Explicit references to values aspects recur throughout the guidelines (SOED 1991-1993).

Alongside the five curricular areas, the 5-14 Programme recognises the importance of the personal and social development of pupils. The guidelines for Personal and Social Development 5-14 are concerned with the pupils' self awareness and self-esteem, with interpersonal relationships and with independence and inter-dependence. Each of these has a values implication.

The Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum has also produced discussion papers on values education (SCCC, 1991; 1992a-d; 1993) which have been issued to both primary and secondary schools in Scotland. These set out five principles for values in education in Scottish schools as:

- appreciation of learning
- respect and caring for self
- respect and caring for others
- a sense of belonging
- social responsibility

It is within this Scottish curriculum context that this research project on values education in primary schools took place. We did not set out to explore teachers' awareness and

knowledge of these documents, but were alert for references to such documents and to their use in teachers' curriculum and assessment plans. The first aspect of the conceptual framework, that values education may include a wide range of areas of belief, seems to fit well with the current thinking on the primary school curriculum embodied in these documents.

The national guidelines for implementing each curriculum area in the 5-14 Programme outline the following: targets for learning, suggestions for delivery, and approaches to assessment and recording. Teachers are required to assess and record progress and to report this to pupils and parents. In the documents for *Personal and Social Development 5-14*, and *Religious and Moral Education 5-14* a clear distinction is made between what should be assessed - knowledge and understanding, attitudes such as respect and tolerance, and skills such as investigating and evaluating - and what may not be assessed - pupils' personal stance on various issues. The three aspects of learning to be assessed (knowledge and understanding, attitudes and skills) are identified in the second aspect of our conceptual framework as cognition, feelings and behaviour all of which play a part in values acquisition.

There are two main models of how values are acquired, inculcation models (see for example Crittenden, 1978; Musgrove and Taylor, 1969), and socialisation models (see for example Cole, 1991; Jordan, 1991). In practice it is usually acknowledged that both play a part. Inculcation emphasises that values are transmitted by deliberate promotion: socialisation emphasises that values are transmitted in more subtle ways, even unconsciously, whether we like it or not. However, inculcation of particular values occurs within a social context, while the methods of socialisation theory, such as setting an example, may be used as a reinforcement of more direct methods of inculcation. In other words, teachers can use the same methods to serve differing purposes.

Consideration of how values can be 'taught' in school tends to emphasise both the assumed passivity of the child and the view that there are 'good' values, even fundamental values, which educators must strive to pass on to children. Yet obviously children start school with their own understandings of values. Should schools be doing more than showing and telling the received wisdom about values, by teaching the children to think for themselves about values? After all, school can only claim to be one socialising medium; others are the influence of the home, the peer group, popular culture, including the mass media, books and so on. Indeed, some research studies have indicated that such influences are more important than school in values acquisition (Musgrove and Taylor, 1969; Sutherland, 1988). Hill (1991) has argued that because school is compulsory its influence on our values may be more easily resisted. Nevertheless, there is a need to recognise that children may be put under some stress if two or more of the groups to which they belong eg home, school, peers, hold different values.

All this relates to the third aspect of our conceptual framework, that values may be expressed at two different levels, fundamental, and contextual. Viewed from a political context, there is an evident need to offer a justification for the particular values promoted in schools. Do our schools promote one social ideal? If so, who decides which ideal should be thus promoted? Or are our schools a site of struggle between 'rival and incompatible' views of what kind of society we should be creating? For example, the issue of separate education for Muslim girls, or the existence of separate schools for particular religious faith groups, such as Jews, Catholics, Church of England adherents, relates to this sectional level of values. So, too, does the existence of public schools, of independent schools, and of the option to educate children at home.

Values conflicts such as these can arise within individual pupils or teachers, but also among groups of pupils and/or teachers. Should such conflicts be recognised in schools and, if so, which ought to be addressed? For example, schools often recognise a conflict between the values pupils bring with them from home and those endorsed by the school. Teachers may encourage conformity to school values. This desire for conformity may cause schools to avoid addressing with pupils the reasons why there are value conflicts. Equally, an overt movement towards a particular conformity within a school may be undermined by values conflicts among the staff themselves. The hidden curriculum as expressed through the behaviour of individual staff members may thus contradict the overt values curriculum of the school as a whole.

The apparent neutrality of schools as a simple mechanism for delivering the curriculum has been questioned by that body of research which focuses on school climate and school culture (eg Rutter *et al*, 1979; Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992). The idea of a hidden curriculum conveying powerful messages to the pupils is now commonplace and indeed a consideration in attempting to achieve a positive school ethos. School ethos itself has recently been the focus of work by the SOED Audit Unit which has produced ethos indicators to assist schools in recognising these 'hidden' elements of school life (SOED, 1992).

This project was concerned with a broad view of values education in primary schools, encompassing the formal curriculum, the informal curriculum of school activities and the hidden curriculum. In our research we have tried to collect data on all three, and to collect interpretations of all three by staff and pupils. We have sought to understand the roles of cognition, feelings and behaviour in values education, and the extent to which there might be fundamental and contextual levels to the understanding of values in schools.

The next chapter describes the aims of the research and provides a broad view of the research approach and methods.

2 Research approach

Research aims

The title of this project conveys its fundamental aim, that of understanding values education in primary schools. More specifically, our aim was to:

- explore the kinds of values currently being taught, explicitly or implicitly in primary schools in Scotland
- investigate teachers', pupils' and parents' perceptions of values education
- explore the ways in which values education takes place
- raise awareness of the ways in which values education takes place.

In carrying out this research we assumed that, potentially, the kinds of values taught may spread across a whole range of areas of belief. We also assumed that values may be fostered through a range of teaching methods and through different curricular and organisational approaches. We were not testing out any particular method or approach and we were not making judgements about particular values. We did not set out with a fixed idea of which values should be taught or of particular methods which should be adopted. We hope that by raising awareness and providing a focus for debate on issues concerning the practice of values education in Scottish primary schools, effective development in this area will be promoted.

The research questions

A set of research questions was developed to provide a focus for the design of the research project as a whole, and for the methods chosen for the empirical investigations. The research questions were:

- What kinds of values do primary teachers see themselves as trying to teach their pupils?
- How do they do this? For example, through school discipline policy, through an explicit curriculum of personal and social education and religious and moral education and/or through subjects without and explicit values label?
- What rationales do they offer for teaching values and what do they see as its purpose?
- What kinds of teaching approaches are used in the context of values education and why? Are these the same as or different from other teaching approaches and why? In particular how do teachers deal with pupils questioning or rejection of certain values?
- Do teachers agree (a) about the kinds of values to be taught and (b) the teaching approaches to be used? By what processes is such agreement reached? If there is no agreement, what prevents consensus emerging?
- Are pupils aware of values education? Do they see a relevance to life outside school?

- Have the schools involved parents in values education? If so in what ways? If not, why not?
- Is the broader community involved in any way?

These questions cover schooling and the culture of the school, with particular relevance to values. They are guides to how we can approach an understanding of values education, given the complexity of schools. They are based on the premises that:

- the key informants are the teachers, their pupils, and the pupils' parents; each group provides a view point and a triangulation of the views of the others
- disagreement may exist within and amongst any of these groups and disagreement illuminates the key issues
- values education may or may not be like other aspects of schooling in its delivery to pupils; any differences or similarities will tell us more about values as well as values education
- the organisation of values education will have some relationship with the whole school and how it works; we can hope to move on from the particular to generalities about values education in primary schools.

The research questions suggest specific methods, located as they are in the idea of *understanding* values education. The next section outlines the research strategy.

Research strategy

What is provided in this section is an overview of the methods by which the information was collected, as a background to the detailed descriptions of findings presented in this report. Readers with an interest in the methodology will find a more detailed discussion of methods used to collect and analyse the data in the Technical Appendix.

Two main approaches to data collection were employed: initial in-depth studies of the practice of five schools, followed by a postal survey of teachers and headteachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools which explored the issues emerging from the case studies.

The decision to carry out the study school phase of the research first was decided on the basis of a reading of the literature and the researchers' previous experience. In the reading two major strands were identified in existing research into values and values education. These were:

- an investigation of definitions of values, or of definitions of values made by specific groups of people
- psychological studies of the development of moral values in children.

Where field research was carried out, it tended to be within the psychological paradigm pioneered by Kohlberg (1981). Yet the researchers' own experience had provided access to the rich tradition of research into the culture of schools, drawing on the many and varied methods which are a strength of the field of educational research. The tools available cover a range including varieties of interview techniques, written instruments and the collection and scrutiny of school documents. However, the usefulness of the tool depends wholly on finding the right questions to ask, both in broad research terms and in practical terms.

Eight research questions were identified as listed above. Some of these research questions were translated into questions used for interviews in the case studies or for the survey questionnaire, and some were used as questions to apply to the data; most were, in fact, used for both purposes. To maximise our chances of reaching an understanding of values education, the questions needed to be applied to a range of people and via a range of methods. This opened the analysis to confirmation of ideas or themes, and allowed for the identification of conflicts or contradictions. The specific methods used in this study are outlined briefly below.

Study school methods

The study school part of the research involved the investigations of teacher, parent and pupil views on values education in five schools. The studies varied slightly in the time spent by researchers in the school or institution as well as the broad or limited number of methods which proved feasible within those visits. In this research, we built on previous experience in an analogous area, that of trying to understand good discipline in classrooms and schools. The methods used there seemed to us to be potentially fruitful in the area of values education. They were, grouped according to the main sources of information:

Staff

- semi-structured interviews with staff, focusing on values education in the classroom and in the school, using ideas developed from the philosophy of values. Target staff for this part of the research were the head, the assistant or depute head (if such a person were in post), one teacher from each stage in the school and any nursery nurse/teacher. Of the 38 interviewed, 4 were male, 3 of these being headteachers. We also interviewed 7 other staff (2 male) which included any ancillary staff in the school and any specialist teaching staff such as the learning support teacher
- reflective interviews with 13 teachers of P1, P4 and P7, focusing on any values education element(s), as identified by the teacher herself or himself in relation to a segment of teaching seen by one of the researchers. This approach places the identification, description and classification of values education firmly with the teacher

Pupils

- group interviews with 62 pupils (28 girls, 34 boys) in 16 groups, focusing on their understanding of what the class teacher and the school deemed to be values education
- a structured writing task for all P5, P6 and P7 pupils, focusing on values education in school and at home. Overall, 268 pupils did this, 142 girls and 126 boys, with slightly more pupils from the 10-11 year age band than from others

Parents

- telephone interviews with 21 parents, focusing on their understanding of school values/values education

Other sources

- field notes, which are an important source of triangulation of ideas in the analysis. These focused on collecting evidence relating to a range of values, to aspects of how people think (cognitive) and feel (affective) and of what they want (volition), and to values conflict or existence of fundamental and/or contextual values
- scrutiny of school documents, again a source of triangulation. These documents included the forward plans of individual teachers and their assessments of class work.

To collect this data we spent a day or two days a week in each of the schools, spread out over a period of two to three months. Basically, each school had from eight full days (in the smallest, two teacher school) to twenty full days of researcher time. In each school, this time included apparently 'dead' time as the researcher or researchers waited to see a particular teacher or group of pupils. This in itself, together with participation in staff coffee breaks and in lunch time chat all added up to a picture of the school. Each school was the responsibility of two researchers, in order to maintain some critical distance on the issues. It is very easy for a single researcher to become ensnared in what the school takes for granted, if the researcher is welcomed into the life of the school. In all cases schools were welcoming, although individual teachers did have reservations or indeed fears about what we might be doing.

Five study schools were chosen on grounds of their size and brief characterisations of each of the schools form part of the more detailed discussion of the study school methodology given in the Technical Appendix. This also includes details about the techniques of eliciting and analysing complex evidence.

Since the purpose of this initial phase of the research was to exploring definitions of values education used by different groups of people – teachers, pupils and parents, there was no need to disaggregate the data by individual school. It was more appropriate to analyse the compendium of information from all five schools. However, in presenting the findings, references are sometimes made to individual schools as designated in the Technical Appendix and where the context seems particularly relevant.

Survey methods

The survey phase of the project was designed to follow on from and expand on the information gathered from the study schools. Questionnaires based on themes arising from the study schools were sent to headteachers and teachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools.

The survey had three main purposes:

- to explore themes arising from the school study data and see whether the issues so highlighted reflect practice in primary schools across Scotland
- to distinguish any further concerns identified by tapping in to the views of a larger number of teachers
- to judge how far issues about values education may be put down on paper in a recognisable form to which people are able to respond.

Two versions of the questionnaire were designed, one for teachers and one for headteachers. These two were mostly identical, but the teacher version included some additional questions on recent practice in their own classrooms, and the headteacher version some questions on management issues.

These questionnaires were sent to a sample of teachers (those of P1, P4 and P7 pupils) and headteachers in 10% of Scottish primary schools. The sample included Catholic and non-denominational schools from the state sector, and independent schools. It also included schools of a broad range of sizes, from single-teacher schools with fewer than 10 pupils to schools with 25 or more teachers and in excess of 500 pupils.

The final response rate was 43%, calculated on the basis of the number of schools from which we received at least one questionnaire. Whilst this meant our sample of responses

was somewhat disappointing, the range was typical of Scottish primary schools as a whole on a number of measures such as school roll, and gender and age of respondents. We received responses from 191 teachers and 119 headteachers in a total of 132 different schools spread across all the Scottish regions. Quantitative analysis of the survey data was carried out by computer using SPSS. This was relatively straightforward once the open responses had been coded, with the attendant difficulties of interpreting this vague and loosely defined linguistic domain that recurred throughout the project. Further details of the survey methodology are given in the Technical Appendix.

The findings from this project, whilst only reflecting the opinions of a relatively small sample of teachers, represent the best evidence currently available about what is happening in the area of values education in primary schools and classrooms across Scotland. A major strength of the research strategy used for this study was that it was a bottom-up process. By starting with the case studies we were able to be open to the teachers' own perceptions of values and values education. We did not start out with a framework to be tested, but from the case studies we were able to draw out some themes to be validated with reference to the views of staff in a larger sample of schools through the medium of the survey. A discussion of further issues relating to the particular methodology adopted is presented as one of the themes in Chapter 7 of this report.

The research team

Many people have contributed to this project. The original research proposal was written and submitted to the Gordon Cook Foundation by Pamela Munn with Margaret Johnstone. They were joined by Mairi-Ann Cullen at the start of the project. This team researched the theoretical context for the project, identified broad aims and the specific research questions to be addressed, drew up and refined the overall research design and carried out the qualitative work in the study schools and wrote the section of the report concerned with the detailed studies in schools. Chapter 1 is also based on their working paper on the theoretical background of the study.

When Pamela Munn, Margaret Johnstone, and later Mairi Ann Cullen, moved to new posts outwith SCRE, a new team (Janet Powney, Peter Glissov, and Ursula Schlapp) continued the research. They carried out the survey and its analysis reported in the third section of this report and synthesised the main themes and findings of the study in the final section of this report. Secretarial support for the project was provided by Joan Ballantine, Janette Finlay, Jennie Jackson and Kay Young.

3 In the classroom

"...it's what's best for the children."

This, and the following two chapters, present the findings from the in-depth case studies in schools. These studies recorded in detail have produced a large bank of data which has been analysed in terms of the main features emerging from the schools. This is done in a largely descriptive way, telling the teachers' stories and adding the comments of their pupils. (Although the evidence from the schools has been aggregated, there are sometimes references to individual schools; readers may find it helpful to refer to the brief profiles of these schools contained in the technical appendix.)

All the teachers in each of the five study schools agreed that it was part of their job to foster values. This positive response arose from a direct question in the interviews. Most of the teachers agreed unhesitatingly, although a minority asked questions such as: 'do you mean religious education?' 'what do you mean, values? is it morals you mean?' With these latter teachers we turned their question back, saying that it was whatever they meant by values, the things they saw as important for their class. Given this cue, it is not surprising that those teachers too agreed that fostering values was part of their job. Teachers are unlikely to say that they do *not* try to promote what they see as important for the pupils in the class. Nevertheless, for both groups of teachers, further discussion of specific values they tried to foster and of the hows and whys of doing this gave an insight into the teachers' understandings of values education and of the values they saw as residing in education in their classrooms and schools. This chapter goes on to describe what the teachers told us about fostering values in the classroom, with additions and interpolations from their pupils and with some preliminary ideas about what all this might mean for values education.

The kinds of values fostered

Religious and moral education is part of the 5–14 curriculum, yet only a minority of the teachers spoke of values in terms of formal religious education, most of this group being in the denominational school. There, the church festivals and the induction of the pupils into the religious community played a strong part in daily life. The values fostered were described by the teachers as 'Christian values' and as one teacher explained:

> *I don't see how you can be a Catholic and not carry that through into how you teach, what you show you value in the classroom. It has to be all of a piece...*
>
> (P7 teacher, School RC)

Pupils from this teacher's class who spoke to us had a lot to say about being a Catholic. Their stories focused less on faith or belief (although this was touched on) and more on what it felt like to be a member of a minority within a hostile environment. Each child told of taunts or threats arising out of their status as pupils of a Catholic school. All agreed, that even so, they wanted to be Catholic. On the other hand, the structured writing drew responses from a few other pupils in the same school who resented or felt slighted by the

emphasis in the classroom and school on the value of a Catholic community. Values and religion were intertwined in School RC, as a central aim of the school, but in the other four schools there was not the same religious driving force behind values education. Fostering values was a matter of less certainty.

For some of the teachers in the other schools, values education was equated with moral education. 'Right and wrong', 'honesty' and 'what is right' were spoken of by these people. However, the majority of teachers, including teachers in School RC, seemed to speak of day to day fostering of values as the promotion of harmonious social relationships, as far as classroom teaching was concerned. The 'golden rule' was quoted as the kind of moral value supporting this 'values education'. Teachers referred to ideas of balance, of social harmony and of living together as a more long-term rationale for this approach to values education. Few people made extensive reference to the place of religious and moral education in the 5–14 programme in reference to either sort-term or long-term aims, although there was a general if non-specific awareness of this.

The teachers spoke at length of the day-to-day fostering of values in the classroom and of what was important for the pupils. Examples of these values were:

- truthfulness, honesty and respect
- fairness
- sharing with others and being kind
- tolerance
- self-discipline and self-control
- self-esteem.

The teachers also spoke about work, work standards and the completion of work and they talked about the pupils being tidy, being quiet and taking turns. Some of the concepts identified by the teachers as values appeared initially rather minor; for example:

- pupils picking up after themselves
- pupils holding the door open.

Taken in context with the rationale and purpose behind those more pragmatic 'values', their apparent triviality is more clearly viewed as one small aspect of a larger values aim of social/environmental concern or thinking of others. Interestingly, the pupils in their structured writing were often quite clear about this, moving from an apparently small statement made by their teacher, eg 'keep the room tidy' to make connections with broader ideas of the world outside school and of environment in general. Tidiness on the small scale was seen as the basis of 'saving our planet'.

The kinds of values quoted by teachers as within their concern if not their power to instil seemed to us to fall into two groups:

- values seen as relevant to the individual (eg work habits, self-discipline, patience, honesty)
- values seen as socially cohesive (sharing, kindness, co-operation, tolerance)

This demarcation is a little blurred in that values relevant for the individual are relevant because of: '...helping [the pupil] fit into society'.

The idea of the pupil being moulded to take his or her part in the group was seen as a legitimate values task in all the classrooms. The cohesion of the class was important to teachers, so much so that pupils who were judged to reject the teacher's values were the

pupils whose behaviour was characterised as difficult. That is, 'bad' (or inappropriate) behaviour was taken to be a rejection of classroom values, in that it was different from the 'good' (or appropriate) behaviour of the class. Where these pupils appeared, they occupied a large share of teacher discussion as the teacher tried to explain how the child was integrated, or how she had come to terms with that child's 'difference'. The development of the individual, infant child into a social being was a running thread throughout teacher discussions on values education. This was a major explanatory theme in the interviews, and it is to explanations and rationales we now turn.

Rationales

The rationales given by the teachers in explaining why certain values were promoted were illuminating. The same value – co-operation, for instance – was fostered for reasons such as:

- *at this stage* (P1) *they're all ego – it's me, me, me*
- *they have to learn to work with other people, for their future in society* (P7)
- *I'm trying to integrate Susan* (a child with physical disabilities) *into the class* (P4)
- *it's part of language skills, how they agree to work co-operatively* (P4/5)

The common theme is that co-operation is good for the individual child and good for the group, although this 'good' is defined in different ways, according to the context of that teacher in that class. Rationales tended to be context based or related to conditions as the teachers saw them, rather than be blanket statements that co-operation (or honesty, or patience, or self-discipline) was just a good thing, a virtue in itself. An important part of these conditions was the teacher's view of the child in her school. That is, how the child in general was summed up and pigeon-holed. In School D, a high percentage of the pupils were seen as deficit in social skills, aggressive and difficult. Of course, this broad characterisation was not seen to apply to each pupil, but overall a rather pessimistic view prevailed. In their writing about what was important in the playground, the School D pupils reflected this concern. In School D, as many children wrote about not fighting in the playground as did in all the other four schools put together (see Chapter 5). This was a situation where the promotion of co-operation in the classroom was seen to fulfil more than one need. The pupils were helped to learn 'basic social skills', 'not to grab things', 'to fit in'. The teacher was helped to gain control over the class. In School A, where the pupils were all known as individuals, there was still a collective view of the pupil as a learner. From that perspective, the promotion of co-operation had to be tempered with a focus on individual effort. The pupils were helped to distinguish between co-operation and relying on other people's work. The teacher was helped in the task of differentiation.

The rationale behind the value seems to us an avenue to explore further. If we say that teachers think a given value is good for different reasons at different times, then is there no stability in what teachers promote as values? This does not appear to be the case, given the general agreement over the values fostered in classrooms. Nor does it appear that the values themselves are wholly contextual; rather, the same value may be brought into play over a range of different contexts.

A further insight into values and rationales may be through methods used in the classroom. Methods themselves carried a values message, it seemed to us, although the teachers in general stated that in fostering values, the teaching methods used were 'just the same as I would use for any part of the curriculum'. We explain this more fully in the next section.

Methods

The teachers' judgement on teaching methods referred to techniques such as:

- discussion
- reading
- drama work/role play
- TV or radio programmes.

The fostering of values called on no special techniques. The teachers spoke of discussion arising from language work, of reading in pursuit of a project on food and health, of drama deriving from work in history and of both schools' broadcasting and television in general as a spur to work on fostering values. Values and the consideration of values were integral to what went on in the classroom, it seemed. In effect, there were values in education of which teachers were aware. This included a much broader idea that anything and everything was grist to the teacher's mill.

At the lowest level of action, there were those teachers who used classroom incidents to praise what they saw as good and sanction what they saw as bad. These teachers seized the occasion to foster values, but unlike some of their colleagues they did not, in addition, create the occasion. Their hope was that values would 'rub off' on the pupils, that values, like measles, would be caught. There was no specific pattern as to where these teachers were or who they were. They were not all teachers of infants, for example, nor were they all teachers in the most stable and 'middle class' of the schools. Furthermore, what these teachers defined as values was not significantly different from the definitions of colleagues who emphasised a more willed or manipulated values education. If values education as part of the curriculum is to be more than time set aside for formal lessons on values topics, then perhaps teachers who share this *ad hoc* and reactive strategy could be encouraged to reflect on their teaching and on values in education as a way of considering how they might initiate as well as react to situations in which values might be expressed.

The initiation of situations for the discussion of values during our visits to the schools largely seemed to arise from language work or from materials like *Feeling Yes, Feeling No*, although games could also be a useful way of creating an arena for values debate. Something emerging strongly from all the schools was that this kind of debate focused on the rationales for values (eg why should we be kind?) rather than on values clarification. This is borne out by what the pupils wrote (see Chapter 5). The pupils overall took a utilitarian view of why they should adhere to values they saw as important to adults in the school. They did not seem to reflect any debate about values.

Ideas about methods appeared to us to be rooted in ideas of how teaching works as much as in ideas of what values are. Some teachers were highly articulate on the hidden curriculum and on how aspects of this, such as the grouping of pupils might foster values. A few, in addition, talked of how they modelled or tried to model the values they saw as desirable. As one of these teachers said:

> *How we as adults behave towards them, and how we behave towards each other shows what we* ***really*** *value. Children aren't stupid. They can see the difference between what I say and what I do.*

This did not mean that these teachers were setting themselves up as role models; it meant that they tried to practice what they preached to their pupils. We shall return to this idea again in the whole school context. Here, we might tentatively raise the idea that teachers

have levels of values awareness and suggest that, like the teacher's craft knowledge, these levels could be tapped and discussed in ways which could help other teachers in the classroom. This brings us around full circle to the idea that fostering values is 'naturally' part of the teacher's job.

Part of the job, part of me

As we stated at the start of this chapter, the teachers agreed that fostering values was part of their job, and they were able to talk in general terms of how they did this. However, two additional points emerged from the data. Firstly, this professional awareness of fostering values was expressed in very broad and general terms. This was evident in the post lesson open or reflective interviews, when the teachers found it difficult to articulate what it was they had done (if anything) to foster values. There are strong parallels here with good discipline, in that it too is an accepted part of the teacher's job, yet it is hard to pin down in relation to immediate past action in the classroom. Like keeping good discipline, fostering values is seen as 'part of me', 'the way I am'. This is our second point, the personal component. For some teachers this was taken for granted as deriving from their own upbringing or from the way in which they had raised their own children. For others, the values stance they took was the product of personal search and commitment.

What might these two different issues imply for a programme of values education? Firstly, the breadth and generality of the teachers' recognition of values education and the lack of precise language to explain it must make it difficult to accord professional status to the enhancement of values education skills. It is apparently something everybody does but not something everybody has the tools to think about. Secondly, any emphasis on personal qualities rather than professional skills as intrinsic to fostering values has all sorts of implications for values education, not least in moving debate from the best methods to the best people.

We should add that, when teachers saw fostering values as simply part of the job of running a classroom, they did not, on the whole, query their right or their responsibility to foster values. Save in cases where some disjunction occurred in their professional lives or where some personal issue arose, they took for granted their role in fostering behaviour they saw as indicative of values. What they did query was the effectiveness of fostering values within a social context which seemed antithetical. They also questioned whether fostering values in the classroom had a long term effect.

Evaluating success

Our own conceptual framework of values and values education postulated that values had three aspects: cognition, feelings and skills. In talking about values, the teachers talked a little about pupil awareness of values and knowledge of values. They talked rather more about feelings and emotions, of using feelings as a way into the recognition of values and as a rationale for adhering to values. However, most of their talk in relation to the evaluation of any success in fostering values was focused on pupil behaviour. Not unexpectedly, what pupils did was seen as reflecting their internalisation of values. Examples were given of pupils sharing with others, of pupils showing consideration and of pupils being fair or kind. Examples of pupils working independently or showing other work-related values were more rarely given. As part of the general documentation in the school, the teachers' forward plans and their evaluation of work done were made available to us. In these detailed and meticulous records, little or nothing was said of

values, save for notes on individual pupils who achieved a degree of independence, or mastery of a topic, or displayed some skill hitherto difficult for them. These gains were noted, but in general no specific reference was made to values or values acquisition in this respect.

Evaluating success was for teachers an *ad hoc* business of collecting examples and impressions within the classroom. Pupil behaviour outside the classroom was not so readily observed, perhaps. Inside the classroom, the teachers had arrived at their own understandings of values education. These seemed to us to range from an unquestioning, taken-for-granted aim to minimise any disruption and maximise any learning, to more complex and ambitious plans to inculcate values for life. These different understandings did not exist in isolation but within the school as a whole. We now move on the role of school management and questions of policy and practice.

4 In the school

"You all have to be part of the team or it doesn't work".

The five primary schools ranged in pupil roll from 30 pupils to 450 pupils. The headteachers therefore had varying workloads, reflected in the fact that of the two larger schools, one had a depute and the other two assistant headteachers. Each school also had its history and context, as Chapter 2 indicated in brief. The headteachers too had a specific history and past experience. For example, one head was recently in post while another had taught at the school for twenty years. Those headteachers with assistant or depute heads in post worked together in different ways to form a management team, and of course each school had its staff of individuals. Nevertheless, all the heads agreed, not surprisingly, that it was the headteacher's task to set the tone for values in the school and the headteacher's responsibility to ensure a policy of values education. The difference lay in how they each went about this, if not in the values they tried to foster. We should add that headteachers replied to a version of the semi-structured interview schedule used with the teachers.

We now look at the values identified, followed by the rationales for these values, then turn to how the heads tried to promote them before going on to further issues.

Values for all the pupils

The values headteachers identified were expressed in slightly different terms and indeed in some cases were only explained as values by the speaker's further elaboration of why this 'value' was being fostered. 'Good manners', for instance, was given as a value, but good manners could be seen as simply a social convention. However, the headteacher who spoke of good manners as a value saw this as one expression of respect for others, not just a social nicety. It seemed to us from the statements of the headteachers, and indeed the teachers too, that in some cases a behavioural indication of holding a value was given as a value in itself. That is, good manners showed that the children were considerate and respected each other, therefore good manners was a values goal to be fostered.

Set out bluntly, the list of values from the headteachers of the five primary schools is quite short and not surprising; the values spoken of were:

- consideration for others (4 schools)
- respect for others (4) and for property and authority (2)
- religious values, a religious community (3)
- a school community (1)
- work (2)
- pupil self-esteem (2)
- self-discipline (1)

The language used by the headteachers in their interviews was imprecise. For example, did they mean that self-esteem was a value or did they mean that there was intrinsic value

or worth in helping the pupils achieve a sense of self-esteem as a stepping stone to better work? As one headteacher said:

> *...a pupil with self-esteem is happy and a happy pupil learns well.*
>
> (School B headteacher)

This is not to suggest that teachers were intrinsically more precise than the headteachers in speaking of values, values education or values in education. The teachers were able to exemplify what they meant by reference to particular pupils or to incidents witnessed by the researcher or to work on the classroom wall. Headteachers inevitably spoke of the broad canvas, the whole school. Examples in this broader context were not impossible: the headteacher in School B spoke of pupil playground behaviour and of the use of special all-school assemblies in relation to 'consideration for others'. Nevertheless, apposite illustrations of values in the whole school were more difficult to give, it seemed. Precision of language was therefore more important, and indeed was recognised by the headteachers in terms of utilising and adapting explanations and terms from the area of ethos indicators.

The values list derived from the headteachers' replies is in itself not contentious, although it is interesting that 'an appreciation of learning' did not feature in all the responses. This is one of the five principles of values in education as conceptualised by the SCCC. Where this value did arise in the case study schools, it was more a question of the value of work in itself rather than the pupil's specific work, that is, learning. We feel that these are not just semantic quibbles, but possible indications of reality as opposed to ideals with which it would be difficult to disagree. However, the lack of mention of 'learning' or of 'work' in three of the five schools might reflect that in these three schools, this was either taken for granted or had been displaced by more urgent concerns about pupil discipline. Good discipline as a pre-requisite of a good learning environment is a theme the researchers have met before, in earlier research.

The other four principles of values in education as offered for discussion by the SCCC were:

- respect and caring for self
- respect and caring for others
- a sense of belonging
- social responsibility

All of these ideas were found in the headteachers' views. This is interesting, and confirms the headteachers' awareness of ideas of school ethos and ethos indicators. Again, this is a main thrust of the work done by the SCCC, but it is also something promoted by the SOED as part of the auditing process of a good school. Each of the headteachers had made some steps towards such an audit and each had raised the idea of school climate or ethos with staff. However, the headteachers' interpretations of the ideas differed. For example, the idea of respect and consideration for others was mediated by the headteachers' definitions of their particular pupils, that is, of what the pupils were like and what respect or consideration would mean to them. We gave some examples of this in the next section, where we look at context and at the rationales given by the headteachers.

■ Rationales in a school context

The title of this section sums up the headteachers' central idea, which was that for 'my pupils', in 'my school', these are the values which are contextually appropriate. Table 4.1 gives an indication of this chain of thought.

Table 4.1 *Headteachers' views of key school value(s)*

School	View of pupils	Value(s)	Rationale
School A	'busy lives' 'middle-class' 'enthusiastic'	honesty, friendliness, consideration	'we know each other so well'. 'it's such a small school'.
School B	'individual' 'all have their own view' 'range of family background' and 'children are more influenced by parents than by school'	a sense of right and wrong and to respect others	'it's how children should behave towards each other, to adults and to society. They learn how they should treat other people by the way we treat them'.
School RC	'just children' 'like my own children' 'my children were at the school and there are other staff with children here'	respect each other, be respectful of authority	'part of our religious education'. 'to be part of the community'. 'to learn to give and to command respect'.
School D	'very few of them have manners' but 'only one or two run riot' 'they like structure' 'we're a microcosm of one end of the social spectrum'	self-discipline	'don't get taught this at home'. 'get them to take responsibility for their own behaviour'.
School E	'in the main from caring and interested families' but 'children depend upon school more because of changing pattern of the family'	consideration for others, for property, for community	'the education of the whole child is important'. 'it's Christian ethics, the basis of our humanity'.

The value in each case is what the headteacher said was the core value aim in his or her school. Each person gave additional value aims, eg 'good manners', 'hard work', or others identified in the list presented above, but the values identified in the tables were given as key to that school. The rationale for fostering the specific value is also shown in the table. Again, this was volunteered at the time, in the semi-structured interview. The descriptions about pupils were those from the headteachers' interviews and in discussion.

These headteachers regarded the value attributed to each in Table 4.1 as key for the school and as contextually appropriate but we should add that 'context' also carries a personal component. For example, the heads of School RC and of School E were both committed Christians. As with the teachers, the context of values education for headteachers may be 'part of me' as well as 'part of the job'.

In relation to the idea of school context and the prioritisation of values, we might ask whether context is taken for granted and what this might imply. For example, we might wonder whether the head of School A is so enmeshed in that small and intimate context

that it is difficult to step back and look at values education. For her:

> *It's not teaching as such, it's the hidden curriculum.*

Although, paradoxically, the hidden curriculum may be central to values education, this teaching head seems curiously unaware of the role of values in education. However, for all the headteachers, stepping back to look at values, values education and values in education could not have been easy. Their perspective on the context may have suggested that there was one value to get right in order to make further progress. Furthermore, it may have suggested that the emphasis should be on pupil behaviours, with the values signalled by these behaviours being taken for granted. The rationales for values as expressed by the headteachers appeared to include little debate about identification of values, although there were some indications of debate over specific points in two of the schools. This apparent certainty (which could conceal doubts not expressed to us) must also make it difficult to step back and look at the school anew. Furthermore, the rationales seemed to us to affect methods used for promoting the value, to which we now turn.

■ Involving pupils in promoting school values

In order to promote values, a headteacher has to develop some ways of involving both pupils and staff. For pupils, the approaches quoted were:

- *the RE programme*
- *moral education*
- *health education*
- *setting out clear guidelines and ground rules*
- *using a school-wide system (a star-chart) to promote positive behaviour*
- *encouraging informal activities such as charity collections or participation in community projects.*

These ways of fostering values in pupils were not an agreed list provided by all the heads. Different headteachers mentioned different approaches, again reflecting context as they saw it. For instance, the star-chart was used in School D, where the promotion of self-discipline was important for pupils seen as lacking 'structure' in their lives. Religious Education was mentioned specifically in School RC and School E, and also in School B; in all three, respect or consideration for others was seen as an important part of values education and the context was seen as familial. Some of the heads spoke about methods used in education in general which deliberately or incidentally conveyed values education, eg drama, role play, school broadcasts. These methods were also identified by the classroom teachers. Where the headteachers went beyond what the teachers said, was in their reference to school wide activities; one major example given was the school assembly.

Assemblies were used to bring pupils together, to encourage a positive climate, and to foster the school's values. For example, in School E assemblies had to be held in series, for different age groups, as space was limited. At these assemblies, a child or children would speak about some event in school or in class, and those assembled would sing together, usually a cheerful gospel song. This approach to fostering cohesion and the value 'respect for others and for the community' may have been seen rather differently by the pupils. As one child in P7 said:

> *I think some people might not actually believe in Jesus and doing a project on him? I mean, I don't really believe in Jesus and how God created us all. I think it's more a scientific answer to that but sometimes you* ***have*** *to believe and it's just an opinion. Like all of the songs at hymn practice are all about God creating us and stuff. Why can't we just have songs that don't necessarily relate to God?*

This was the view of only one child, but it may serve to indicate the gap between intention and interpretation in respect of values education. This is an area where exploration of the impact of school action on the pupils might benefit the headteachers.

There was a further possible contribution towards the pupils' early recognition of school values. This was through the school nursery department, a provision found in three of the schools. In all three schools with nursery departments, the place of the nursery in socialising the child was recognised. For example, the headteacher (School B) spoke at length of the role of the nursery and the essential character of the nursery teacher's role in relation to values. In speaking of the nursery and of the early stages of primary school, this headteacher and other teachers in the school seemed to favour a developmental view of the child in relation to values. This developmental view was echoed in the other schools, but the nursery staff and the role of the nursery in relation to values were not so clearly perceived. School size, location of the nursery and relationships between staff may have obscured the nursery's potential role in Schools D and E. In School B, the nursery staff were fully part of the teaching team, and shared breaks and lunch with other teaching staff. Furthermore, all staff in School B had been involved by the headteacher in promoting the school ethos, to the extent that the ancillary staff spoke of themselves as part of the school team. This was done by constant contact with ancillary staff, by talking to them and identifying their concerns.

The role of ancillary staff and their relationship with pupils was something of importance to all the headteachers. In School RC and in School E, the headteachers had each set about some training for ancillary staff, focusing on school standards of behaviour and on good discipline policies. How pupils behaved towards ancillary staff was also seen as indicative of the success of values education. However, the main focus of headteacher effort in promoting an ethos or a school policy was the teaching staff. The teachers were seen as the key people through whom the pupils derived their awareness of values in the school.

■ Involving teachers in promoting school values

All the classroom teachers were asked whether, within their school, there was agreement or disagreement in respect of values education. The teacher data also gave clear indications of what each teacher believed this values education to be. The headteachers' views on this agreement were central to how they saw the promotion of values education and to how they judged the possibility of success. Table 4.2 shows what the headteachers' views were; furthermore, their views seemed to us to reflect the picture given in Table 4.1.

Table 4.2 *Headteachers responses to: Do teachers in your school agree about whole school values?*

School	Agreement	Explanation given
School A	'Yes'	'we're both of the same era: we have the same ideas'.
School B	'Yes, in the main. This includes **all** our staff and the lollipop man too'.	'I talk to staff: it rubs off on staff; they're like that as people; using the ethos indicators, we have a questionnaire for all staff'.
School RC	'Yes, and this includes the non-teaching staff, some of whom are not Catholic'.	'we've talked about this: we have to talk about this to help staff from (the amalgamated school) settle in; it's an RC school'.
School D	'Yes: even the non-teaching staff have the same expectations'.	'we have discussions leading to policy; I tell the teachers what I expect'.
School E	'not always (re teachers and RE); otherwise yes, and I'm trying to make sure non-teaching staff agree'.	'it's me working away at it: having discussions with staff who disagree (about RE); in-service for both teachers and non-teaching staff on school policy; using ethos indicators'.

From all the responses, simply talking to each other was the accepted way of promoting a desired policy or a desired outlook on values education. Although 'talking' or 'discussion' was not formally stated as an explanation of agreement by the head of the smallest school, it was apparent from the interaction between the two staff that they were friends and did talk to each other about the school and the pupils. In each school, therefore, the idea of values was seen as being raised and aired with all staff. However, only two of the headteachers stressed that **how** management talked to staff and how staff talked to each other was an important way of fostering values. Neither head would claim to be a role model, but nevertheless each spoke of the importance of treating colleagues with respect and of listening to colleagues. This was seen as a way of deliberately modelling the kind of values the headteachers intended the teachers to foster. Perhaps coincidentally, the teachers in these schools and the ancillary staff we spoke to appeared to agree with whole school policy in broad terms.

It is a truism to say that, where staff feel they have a genuine share in school policy or in the identification of what is important for the school, there is a more positive attitude towards putting that policy in action. This was the case in these two schools. One way of giving staff such a share is for the headteacher to relinquish some of the power of that role by listening and by respecting colleagues' views. In the two schools where this happened, one had a shared religious context while the other had a certain collective spirit, perhaps even a 'female voice'. Did this make it easier for these heads to share power? Or did the size of the schools make it easier for the heads to create the kind of atmosphere in which power could be shared? The whole issue of how agreement is reached between teachers, and how the headteacher creates agreement is a complex one. It is an important issue for

values education, where, as we have noted, the personal element is recognised by all participants. Again, this is an area we feel we need to explore more fully if we are to identify ideas which would be of practical use to headteachers considering their values education programme, but we feel that some basic themes are already emerging.

■ Values and discipline

For some of the headteachers, talking about values was entwined with talking about good discipline. This was the case with teachers too, and the pupils in their structured writing reflected a concern with good (or appropriate) behaviour. In the whole school context, in all five schools, this admixture of discipline and values surfaced in two major injunctions:

- don't fight
- don't bully.

It is interesting that these were expressed as negatives. Value concepts tended to be phrased positively, by teachers at least, if not by the pupils. For example, 'honesty' rather than, 'don't tell lies' or 'don't steal' was a value, as was 'being kind' rather than, 'don't hurt others'. The pupils appeared more prone to use the negative: 'don't take other people's things', 'don't leave people out of your games'. This appeared to us to be a reflection of the way in which school rules tend to be formulated, as 'don't' rather than 'do'. Of course, teachers and headteachers spoke in positive terms of encouraging co-operation, consideration and respect for others in the pupils. Nevertheless, in relation to fighting and to bullying, these negative rules were seen as an important part of good discipline. The openly prohibitive quality of these rules was important. Why was this so?

Bullying has of course been an issue at the forefront of teacher concern recently. Overall, in the schools, teachers and pupils agreed that bullying was to be condemned and that teachers had both the right and the duty to stop it. The negative 'no bullying' was in fact seen as an affirmation of a willingness to act positively in a moral way. 'No fighting', on the other hand, was a more contentious demand. Firstly, in all of the schools there were pupils (usually boys) who felt that teachers did not appreciate the distinction between 'toy fighting' and real aggression. The former was perhaps in the pupils' eyes a legitimate exercise, but for the (mainly female) primary school teachers the picture was different. As one teacher in School B said:

...they start it then they get carried away and don't know how to stop.

Secondly, in two of the schools at least, the idea of not fighting was seen by staff in the school as going counter to what parents or a percentage of parents taught. As one teacher in School D put it:

...for these kids, it's a dog eat dog world out there.

Although pupils and some parents might disagree with the idea of not fighting, headteachers saw 'no fighting' as part of school discipline policy, as did the teachers. Fighting was indicative of a failure in respect or in caring. We wondered about the pupils' perceptions of this rule. As we have said, pupils made distinctions between fighting and 'rough games', which they too sometimes recognised could get out of control. When they wrote about 'no fighting' in the home context or as a personal issue, it was not clear whether their views and rationales would in any way reflect school rationales.

Looking at staff views in the two schools we have drawn on for discipline and values relationships, we would say that overall School B placed emphasis on pupil happiness and

on harmony, which the headteacher saw as intrinsic to any kind of progress for the pupils. School D, on the other hand, placed emphasis on structures and on the clarity of demand on pupils. The pupils themselves tended to write that you shouldn't fight because you might get hurt, or someone could get hurt or people in general could get hurt. This pupil response was found in all five schools, although there were indications of difference, which we discuss in Chapter 5.

■ Evaluating success

For the headteachers, evaluating success was difficult. For a start, how far does the school extend? All of the heads made mention of the playground, and of how the children related to each other out of the formal classroom situation, but none had as yet made any systematic use of this information. In some cases the staffroom or headteacher's room overlooked the playground. This was a useful source of impressions. There was also the role of the playground auxiliary in drawing attention to pupil behaviour, but this tended to relate to discipline usually and to breaches of good discipline at that.

The idea of extension of the school also had a temporal dimension. That is, there is values education for the purposes of the school and values education for life. When asked about the evaluation of success, four headteachers – like the teachers – spoke of both. In School D, the headteacher spoke more about how he defined his own job than about the evaluation of success, a reflection of his limited time in the post. However, the other four heads all had views about the immediate and the long-term success of values education. These views were expressed very differently. We give the gist of each individually, to allow possible connections with Tables 4.1 and 4.2 to be followed through.

They know what I want, what I expect... they can repeat what you see as values, parrot your views – but they won't necessarily do it.

It's so difficult to quantify. Children have their own values... it has to be a standard or code they think is important or once they're up it's all forgotten.

(School A headteacher)

[Of the discipline procedures] I feel it works, the children like to be listened to.

Children will go with parents because that's all they know, so either they reject what we offer or they say, well, we adapt to that value in the school.

(School B headteacher)

It's hard to define what an abstract ethos means... but in terms of what we see, there are things we can see: how they work with each other, how they co-operate with each other, how they address each other. How they play with each other in the playground (.....) It's all these things.

At the end of the day, we can direct them, we can punish them etc, etc, but at the end of the day they are the ones who take the decisions.

(School RC headteacher)

No problem, they want to do what's right.

If there are problems [speaking of behaviour outside the school] it's usually not the child's fault.

(School E headteacher)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In all four of these schools, the heads were in fact happy with pupil behaviour. Although each head mentioned a specific problem issue or child in difficulty, each also felt that overall there were 'no real problems' in the school and that pupil behaviour was more or less as they would wish it to be. Not all of the heads saw this as evidence of the internalisation of values, however, as the quotations from School A, School B and School RC show. This uncertainty about the future success of their efforts did not seem to have stopped the heads from taking on a responsibility for values education. On the other hand, they did not see themselves as wholly responsible for the success of any planned programme, a view with which teachers tended to agree. Furthermore, given the centrality of good discipline to school life, it is easy to understand why pupil behaviour rather than values can become the focus of values education. As the new head of School D said: 'It's what makes the school work'.

5 Pupils' perspectives on values

"I need an education" (pupil, P6)

Any picture of values in the classroom or values in the school is incomplete without some indication of what the pupils themselves saw as the values being fostered by their teachers. As part of the detailed studies, we investigated the pupils' perspectives on values at school. However, as the teachers noted, home influences played a large part in how the children responded to classroom demands or expectations. Indeed, for some of the teachers themselves, their own family and home background were spoken of as integral in explaining how and why these teachers fostered particular values. Our research could not extend to an investigation of the home backgrounds of either pupils or teachers, but we could and did seek information from the pupils on the relevance of teacher's values to home life. Furthermore, we were able to talk to a limited number of parents, who gave their views on values in the school and at home. The latter data is illustrative only of the parent sample who were volunteers identified for us by the headteachers. Their views may or may not have been typical of the majority of parents, therefore references to these views are restricted. The pupil data is perhaps of broader generalisability. A brief summary of how and from whom this information was gathered follows here. A more detailed discussion of the methods can be found in the Technical Appendix.

In each of the five case study schools, pupils provided two different kinds of data, derived from different approaches. These approaches were:

- all pupils in P5, P6 and P7, and on occasion from P4, if the class was a composite P4/5, were asked to complete a writing task. Overall, 268 pupils did this.
- small groups of pupils from P1, P4 and P7 (classes whose teachers had given a series of reflective interviews) took part in group interviews. Overall, there were 16 of these group interviews, involving 62 pupils in total. Each group of pupils included one child whose parent was also interviewed.

The writing and the group interviews both asked the pupils to focus primarily on what the class teacher said was important for the class. Both methods investigated the pupils' perceptions of what their teachers did to foster values, rather than what the pupils themselves saw as a value.

Before we move on to what the pupils wrote and said about values, we should perhaps revisit teacher definitions of values, another important context. For each teacher, we had data on what that teacher said were the values she/he fostered. However, as we suggested in Chapter 3, good classroom behaviours or desirable social behaviours were initially more readily identified by many of teachers than were values. For example, 'pupils holding the door open' was identified as a value fostered by a teacher who, in discussion, made it clearer that this was for her part of a deeper value of care and concern for others. This emphasis by the teachers on behavioural manifestations of a value is important in looking at how the pupils perceived classroom values.

Pupils and classroom values: the group interviews

In the group interviews, the interviewer offered to each group of pupils an idea emerging from the series of reflective interviews with their class teacher. That is, the interviewer suggested that 'your teachers thinks (value x) is important for the class' The pupils then talked to the interviewer and to each other about whether their teacher did stress value x, and, if so, what the teacher meant by value x. The actual words used to convey 'value x' were taken from the teachers themselves, eg 'sharing', 'working together' or 'good manners'. Some of these words related more clearly to behaviour than to values, but in our group interviews we tried to get at the values underlying behaviour by always asking 'why?', 'why does your teacher say this?'. For all the groups, there was agreement that the behaviour or value suggested by the interviewer was indeed important to the teacher. This might indicate a placatory response from the pupils, given that they had seen their teacher and the interviewer on friendly terms, but for the older pupils at least the discussion moved into greater depths. The pupils recognised the behaviour or value and were able to talk about what this means both to the teacher and to them as persons. For example, in the classroom referred to earlier, where the teacher stressed good manners as an expression of caring, pupils had this to say:

Interviewer: *These things (good behaviour), do you like doing these things?*

Alan: *Yeah. (Pause) Sometimes.*

Donnie: *...sometimes.*

Jane: *...not always.*

Interviewer: *Uuhu. When do you not like it?*

Donnie: *Maybe when she stands and rows at you, and you just take it out on everyone else,she's, she says about please and thank you and everything like that.*

Jane: *Sometimes, when my brother gets my bike or wants to borrow something...(inaudible word)...feel jealous. I just go to my room 'til I feel better.*

This brief extract shows how these pupils moved from a behaviour, 'good manners', towards their own feelings and towards some of the problems of caring for others, the value underlying good manners, in their teacher's view. Other interview groups were also able to reach a consensus view about their recognition of what the teacher stressed, although the relevance of that stressed behaviour or value might be debated by the group. For example, the pupils were not afraid to express their disagreement with what they recognised, as we noted in Chapter 4 with the example of the girl in primary 7 who asked:

Why can't we just have songs that don't necessarily relate to God?

The pupils also identified values in the hidden curriculum in their talk, as the extract from an interview with a primary 1 group showed:

Lorna (to Gordon): *We're in the yellow group!*

Gordon: *Which is the top.*

Billy and interviewer together (to Gordon): *How do you know?*

Gordon:	*Because we always do the real assignments first and then we do all the rubbish.*
Lorna:	*He means all the gluing and stuff.*
Interviewer:	*Thinking about your class, what's a real assignment?*
Gordon:	*Well, reading.*
Others:	*Maths/sound book/jotter/reading.*
Interviewer:	*These are the real assignments? And what's all the other stuff?*
Lorna:	*Gluing.*
Margaret:	*I like gluing.*
Billy:	*So do I.*
Gordon:	*I don't like it because I always get my hands stuck together.*
Lorna:	*I always get my hands stuck together.*
Billy:	*I love getting my hands stuck together!*
Gordon:	*When I get them stuck together I can't do my work.*
Lorna:	*I can't do my work either, if I get them stuck.*

Gordon knows he is in the top group and associates this with valuing academic work above craft work whereas Billy, who likes gluing and getting his hands sticky, does not perceive the hidden curriculum defining the groups within his class.

The teacher of this class spoke of values in terms of work. She focused very strongly on work, on building learning skills and an independence in learning, which may well have led to a hidden curriculum in which some skills were more acceptable than others and some pupils saw themselves as superior to others in their capacity for teacher-approved work.

These examples of how pupils saw values in the classroom could be added to indefinitely. The major point to make is that the pupils recognised what was proposed to them by us as their teacher's values concern. They did not necessarily accept this uncritically, but there was little questioning of the teacher's right to set this values agenda:

You've got to learn all these things.

It's so you can learn.

It's so you can get a job, do what you want to do.

However, these views were expressed in group discussion, to an adult interviewer. The writing task offered a more individualised structure, in that the pupil was asked to write in privacy about what he/she thought his/her teacher said was important, and why.

■ Writing about values in the classroom

Three broad themes emerged on initial analysis of the pupil data. These themes all centred on good pupil behaviour: *attention in class*, *tidiness* and *concentration on work* were apparently the behaviours most often stressed by teachers as important, according to their pupils. It appeared that being a pupil imposed the same demands on the children,

regardless of the individual teacher's values agenda. However, each pupil had in fact written of two 'important things' spoken of by his/her teacher, which gave scope perhaps for a common or 'state of being a pupil' response and an individual or 'the classroom message for me' response. In looking at the responses more closely, first class by class then child by child, a better differentiated view of values and valued education emerged.

Firstly, taking the pupils class by class showed a range of patterns of response. That is, some classes were almost unanimous in reporting what was important to their teachers: 'listen' and 'only talk quietly'. Other classes appeared to be divided on gender lines, with girls reporting: 'work' and 'think of others', while boys reported 'not talking' and 'good behaviour'. In addition, there were classes where almost every child reported some different facet of their teacher's efforts. However, in all these cases, that which was identified as important to the teacher was indeed something spoken of by that teacher in her interview. Generally, that 'something' was a behaviour seen by the teacher as indicative of a deeper value, for example 'the manners in the class' (pupil, P6, School E) reflected for that class teacher 'consideration for other people'. More rarely, the 'something' reported by the pupil directly reflected the teacher's values agenda: 'to be kind to each other' and 'to respect other people in the class' (pupils and teacher, P7, School E).

The interesting thing was not that the pupils reported teachers as emphasising behaviours or actions, but that some classes reported a limited number of behaviours while others reported a wide range. At the same time, some classes almost wholly reported group or classroom control actions: 'listen', 'don't shout', 'be tidy', while in other classes a substantial minority wrote about actions linked to feelings and to thought for others: 'get along with each other and share'. This latter could be seen as a more sophisticated form of classroom control, of course. Without talking to the pupils, we cannot say why each individual selected the teacher message that he/she reported, but from the written response it seemed that some teachers gave multiple messages and others gave limited messages about what was important in the classroom. Those who appeared from the pupils' writing to give more limited messages may have decided to approach their values goals step by step, or they might have been deceiving themselves (or us) when they talked of their values goals in the classroom. Alternatively, they may have focused on behaviours, the indication of values in action, without speaking to the pupils of reasons in the wider values context. In the teacher interviews, values only emerged clearly when goals *and* reasons were discussed by the teacher. We move on now to look at the reasons given by the pupils for the behaviour or action they saw as important to their teacher, for their class, and at possible values connections.

■ Reasons, explanations and connections

To an extent, the pupils recognised that certain behaviours: 'not talking', 'pay attention', 'be tidy', 'get on with your work' were legitimated by the classroom itself. They recognised that the teacher was trying to create positive working conditions: 'you couldn't hear if everybody talked', 'I need to concentrate'. Sometimes these conditions were irksome. After all, 'if you talk it improves your English', but they were part of being a pupil. However, in looking at the reasons pupils ascribed to their teachers and at the reasons pupils gave for their own agreement or disagreement with the importance of the desired action or behaviour, a more complex picture emerged. This was true even for apparently straightforward behaviours such as 'listening'. In unpacking the reasons ascribed to teachers and the reasons for personal agreement or disagreement, some indications were given of values.

For instance, in one specific classroom, where almost all the pupils noted that their teacher said it was important 'to listen', different reasons for this were cited; this teacher reportedly said it was important to listen because:

- *if you don't listen you won't know what to do*; a straightforward pragmatic justification
- *it is rude not to listen to people or your teacher*; good manners are important, listening indicates acceptable social skills
- *if you don't listen to other people then when you ask something, they won't listen to you*; do as you would be done by.

The teacher of these pupils spoke of listening as indicative of consideration for others, and also in pragmatic terms as necessary with a large class in a very small room. The reasons the class quoted for listening reflected this pragmatic concern for working conditions, but also wider considerations of appropriate social behaviour and reciprocity of behaviour. Following through this same class, we found a diversity of views which appeared to reflect different ideas about values. For example, the reasons given for personally accepting the importance of listening ranged from fear of punishment (although this was rare) to personal gain to the good of others, as this list shows:

- *if you don't , you don't know what you'll be doing today*
- *if you don't listen you will never learn*
- *if you don't finish your work you feel miserable and you don't learn as much as you could do*
- *you might think you would get into trouble*
- *if the teacher is talking you have the right to know*
- *it's for your benefit*
- *[if you do listen] people will think you are a nice person but if you don't they will think you are rude*
- *you might hurt somebody's feelings*
- *we wouldn't be able to hear each other if we all talked at once*
- *if it's noisy I can't get on very well*
- *if you don't listen you won't learn as much and not get a good job.*

These statements seemed to reflect what the teacher had said about the value of work and the value of good manners and consideration for others, but the children had chosen in the main to emphasise the effect on themselves in ways which could be called utilitarian. We shall return to this in the next section, but first we look briefly at how the pupils saw the actions or behaviours stressed by their teachers as impinging on the home context.

Behaviours like 'listening' also applied at home: 'it's important to listen to your Mum and Dad'. Home, however, was different from school; for example: 'you have to talk at

home, to get messages around'. Sometimes the differences between home and school were logistical: 'there's only four of us at home, not 31'. For other pupils, it was a matter of compartments: 'You don't learn maths/do school work/don't have to work at home'. In fact, the majority of pupils agreed that what was important at school was important at home, at least on occasion: 'you might have to be quiet if you are listening for the phone'. Those who disagreed tended to disagree on the grounds that home was not school, rather than cite their parents as disapproving of or disagreeing with perceived classroom demands. This did emerge in a few replies: 'My Mum doesn't care' or 'My parents don't say to', but these were very few. The divorce of home and school in relation to work is interesting, given the teachers' emphasis on work and work standards as being part of the values they fostered. The idea of parents as partners in the work of the school was not mentioned by the teachers, although parental influences on the children's values was noted.

Here we might add that the small number parents (N=21) we spoke to were positive, if vague, about ways in which the class teacher or the school fostered values. In general, these parents assumed that: 'the school carries on what we began'. Unless their children showed that they were adopting different values, perhaps by behaving in unexpected ways, the parents took it for granted that school and home were on the same tracks. Few of the parents were able to identify how they assessed the school's promotion of values, other than by: 'the way I see them behave in the playground' or 'the things she says at home'. The parents we spoke to had no difficulty in talking of their own values and of what they hoped to promote in their children. Furthermore, they had been selected for us by the headteacher and were perhaps regular supporters of the school. It was interesting therefore that their knowledge of values education in school was limited to assumptions and what they saw as common sense. It was also the case that these parents saw themselves as holding the prime responsibility for the values education of their children, not the school. Would this also be the case for parents seen by teachers as lacking in values? We can only speculate about parents in general, given the limited nature of our sample, but we can explore a little more the pupils' concepts of values as utilitarian or perhaps as context bound.

■ Useful and good values

Returning to the agreement or disagreement expressed by the pupils as individuals, we found that, whatever it was the teacher was said to stress, this was agreed to be important to pupils personally. Only about 5% of the pupils disagreed with the importance of the action or behaviour they quoted: this rose to 11% in School D, which the teachers saw as having a difficult catchment area. As a note of caution, we should add that disagreement could paradoxically be positive. An example of this was the child who wrote that 'keeping things tidy' was not important for her: 'because I do this already'. Such false negatives were discounted where evident, but their existence indicates that pupils' written data has to be approached with caution. Ambiguous phrasing and limited explanations can obscure the child's real intent.

With this warning proviso in mind, the pupils' personal views could nevertheless be allocated to different categories of response. These were:

- the *utilitarian*, agreeing because: 'I want a good job' or, more rarely, 'you might get into trouble'
- *cognitive* reasons, agreeing because: 'it helps you to understand' or 'to learn to think'

- *affective* reasons, agreeing because otherwise: 'it hurts people's feelings and it is so horrible', or 'you can get enjoyment out of doing it [work] neatly'
- *moral* reasons, largely unexpanded, agreeing because: 'it is right'
- *do as you would be done by*, agreeing because: 'things are easier if you help each other'.

About 50% or more of the responses could be put into the first of these categories, although this was not always the straightforward and self-centred response it might appear. The pupils had been asked to write down whether 'what the teacher says is important' was important to them as individuals, therefore replies tended to be based on 'I' and 'me' rather than on society in general or children in general. Nevertheless, within this *utilitarian* category there were references to other people, at least in terms of safety or physical hurt potentially caused, for example, by: 'running in the classroom'.

The percentage of responses put in this category called *utilitarian* varied from school to school, with School B pupils giving fewest and School RC pupils most of this kind of answer. Similarly, percentages of responses falling into the other four categories varied. Different overall patterns were found in each of the schools after the *utilitarian* response had been set aside. For example, School A had a high incidence of *cognitive* reasons, almost to the exclusion of other reasons given. School B had a high incidence of *affective* reasons, reflecting perhaps the emphasis in that school on positive feelings as integral to a successful school. Pupils in School RC gave all four kinds of reason, with *cognitive* reasons predominating, while in School E and School D, both *affective* reasons and *moral* reasons featured equally. The diversity of views about values signalled by these pupil responses seemed to indicate different levels of awareness or levels of thinking about values, or different teacher approaches in the schools. Ideas of moral development should be treated with caution, given that the older pupils were able to express themselves more fluently. Developing communication skills could well be taken for developing values. In any case, the development of values could only be studied in a longitudinal sample.

Looking at the pupils overall, that which was seen by them as useful was more readily accepted as important to them; that which was 'good' was rarely mentioned. Beyond this, there was a divergence between what the teachers saw as fostering values and what the pupils gave as reasons for accepting what the teachers said. The teachers spoke of feelings and building empathy, of examples and of the hidden curriculum of adult behaviour in the school. The pupils wrote about learning, understanding and improving their knowledge more often than they did about feelings. As we reported, under the heading of Methods, in the previous chapter the teachers tended to encourage debate about the reasons for adhering to values rather than a more philosophical debate about what a value is, or might be. Perhaps the pupils' leaning towards cognition rather than feelings might encourage teachers towards more debate and a greater emphasis on thinking about values? On the other hand, there were rare classes where the teacher seemed to have conveyed successfully the importance of feelings and the affective component of values education. Such an approach may call for greater skills or greater commitment than is generally recognised.

These pupils perspectives and our speculations have been confined to the classroom. We move on now briefly to the playground, a vital part of the school to pupils.

■ In the playground

In looking at how the teachers fostered values and what they meant by this, we studied both individual classrooms and the whole school. We wanted to investigate matches and

discontinuities among the staff in a school, and whether staff had any sense of group action on values or of school ethos. With the pupils, we asked them about what their teacher emphasised (the interview groups) and also asked them to write about the classroom and the playground. The preceding sections have described the pupils' perspectives on what their teachers said and offered some speculations about pupils and values education. We now move briefly on to pupils writing about the playground.

We decided to ask pupils to write about playground expectations instead of whole-school expectations for two reasons:

- if pupils had internalised classroom values, then these might emerge out of the classroom, in the playground
- the playground is an area of school least supervised by teachers and 'owned' by the pupils themselves, therefore perhaps subject to the pupils' own rules and values.

We should add that previous work with pupils, in relation to school discipline (Munn, Johnstone and Chalmers, 1992) had indicated that it would be extremely difficult to provide the pupils with cues or a written task encouraging them to think of the whole school. Pupils had tended to visualise 'the school' as corridors, toilets and the playground. That is, the whole school was likely to be anywhere not a classroom rather than a broad concept of the school community.

As with the earlier work on school discipline, we found that for pupils in all five of our schools the majority of things reported as being stressed by the grown-ups were expressed as 'don't' rather than 'do'. It is difficult to rephrase 'don't bully' or 'don't fight' as positives, of course, but 'no litter' could be turned around, as School E showed. The broad, general picture in each school was as shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: *Pupils playground expectations in the five case study schools*

School A	School B	School RC	School E	School D
safety	don't bully	don't drop litter	bin the litter	no litter
not to fight	don't fight	no bullying	safety	no fighting
	no litter	no fighting	safe games	
	include others	safety	(no British buildogs)	

Within each of the schools there were unclear replies, very individual replies: 'don't get holes in your trousers' for example, and additional varied replies such as:

- don't swear
- keep the rules
- don't kick stones
- help each other
- let people play in your games
- set an example to the little ones.

Nevertheless, the overall picture for each school was, as shown in Table 5.1, largely one of prohibitions. Safety rules too were expressed as negatives: 'don't play near the cars' and

'don't leave the perimeter of the school'. It appeared that the pupils had more in common in being children in playgrounds than they had distinctive, school-based differences, with *one exception*. In School B, one in seven pupils wrote about sharing and including others. This was a policy of the school stressed by the headteacher. It was also noted by School B parents, one of whom expressed both surprise and pleasure at the way older pupils helped and played with the younger pupils in the school playground. However, whether the behaviours desired or rules promoted were similar or dissimilar across the schools, it was the pupils' reactions to these rules which might indicate their awareness of values.

Playground rules and pupil reactions

As with the classroom rules, most pupils agreed that playground rules were rules which were important at home: 'again, somebody could get badly hurt'. In the main, school prohibitions were 'for your safety' and accepted as such save where logically they did not apply: 'at home you might not be beside a road'. These prohibitions were agreed to be important to the pupils as individuals too, either because: 'I might get hurt' or 'people might get hurt'. However, school prohibitions were debated by a minority of pupils. For instance, some games could not be shared: 'you have a right to say 'No!'' and on occasion: 'it's alright to be alone'.

It was also the case that school and home differed, for boys particularly: 'at home you might have to fight to defend yourself'. Fighting (or not fighting) was one aspect of playground life which drew a mixed response from the pupils, and some varied chains of writing. Some examples of these are shown in Table 5.2:

Table 5.2 *Boys' and girls' comments on fighting*

	Boy 1	Boy 2	Boy 3	Boy 4
Grown ups say:	'Don't fight'	'Don't fight'	'Not to fight'	'No fighting'
Why?	'They don't want you to get hurt'.	[no reason given]	'If you fight you get bruises and black eyes'.	'People get hurt'.
Is this important at home; why?	'Yes, because not only you'll get hurt you'll get a row and probably no pocket money'.	'Not really, because if at home you are attacked you need to fight back'.	'Yes. If you fight you might get seriously hurt'.	'No, I've no one to fight with'.
'Is this important to you; why?'	'Yes, because I don't like getting hurt'.	'At school yes, but at home no, because you get into trouble at school'.	'Yes. Fighting gets you nowhere'.	'No. I like fighting'.

	Girl 1	Girl 2	Girl 3	Girl 4
Grown ups say:	'Not to fight'	'Not to fight'	'No swearing, no fighting'.	'Not to fight'
Why?	'You could hurt one another'	'You may hurt someone and you should not fight you should discuss it with them'.	'If you swear in front of wee ones they will end up swearing too'.	'It just gets you into trouble'.
Is this important at home; why?	'Yes, because you will still hurt each other'.	'Yes. You might hurt people'.	'Maybe. I am allowed to fight but I am not allowed to swear in my home or outside'.	'Yes, you could get hit by your Mum or Dad'.
Is this important to you; why?	'Yes. It's not nice to fight'.	'Yes. You should not fight with people'.	'Yes. My big brother threatens me'.	'Yes. It just is'.

The boys and girls quoted above were taken at random from those in all five schools who wrote about not fighting, and there is a slight gender difference for this playground action: boys refer to self and the girls refer to others in their replies. This was only marginally the case when all the 'no fighting' responses were followed through. In School D, for example, where as many children wrote about not fighting in the playground as in all the other schools put together, both girls and boys were equally divided in giving 'self' based reasons and 'other' based reasons.

This particular action, fighting in the playground, also drew what might be a moral response, albeit on a very small scale. Of the 89 pupils (33%) who wrote about this, a handful simply stated that fighting was bad. An equal handful wrote that fighting was 'not nice' a different and rather more genteel response. This was the only playground behaviour to elicit such reasons for personal acceptance of the school's prohibition. Reasons were more generally tied to consequences than to simple good or bad. Consequences, in fact, were very important in the chain of writing, as we now go on to discuss.

■ Another kind of value

In an early working paper, (Cullen, Munn and Johnstone, 1993) we suggested that values could be more than religious or moral beliefs, that there were different areas of belief lying at the heart of an individual's values system. This is a stance we may wish to re-argue, but in relation to the pupils we found a very strong strand of care for the environment. This, we felt, was expressed as beliefs and as values. Each of the schools had an anti-litter policy, although only the pupils in the four larger schools wrote extensively about litter and the playground. School E in particular had had a recent anti-litter campaign, and 60% of the pupils there wrote about putting litter in the bin or not dropping litter. The chain of writing was very similar in each school, that dropping litter is messy, untidy and environmentally unfriendly.

Rather more girls than boys wrote about not dropping litter (F=59, M=45). Few gave a personal rather than general reason for accepting this; only three girls liked things to be tidy and one boy wanted to avoid getting a row. There was one single child who did not agree with his school's anti-litter policy: 'it will all disappear eventually'. All the other reasons given for accepting the school stance were reasons based on thinking of others. A minority wrote that it was important for the school to look good, for everyone's sake and: 'in case we have visitors'. The majority wrote in rather more altruistic terms of saving Britain, the planet or birds and animals from the effects of pollution.

There were three particularly interesting aspects of this response. Firstly, there was the high percentage of pupils overall (39%) who wrote about this, and mostly in terms of the general good. Secondly, the actual topic itself is reinforced in the media, often in ways designed to appeal to younger people. Thirdly, acting against pollution is not only acceptable and even exciting, it is something which might be presented as part of the curriculum, as drawing on cognitive skills. In other words, teaching about pollution and how to stop it could be a legitimate, professional classroom activity.

Conclusion

The testimony from pupils on values fostered by their teachers is not as clear as it could be. The pupils' language skills got in the way of their thoughts, at least in the structured writing task. It was clear that home and school were logically different, but not that they demanded different values. It was also clear that in the classroom, acceptance of what the teacher stressed was based largely on potential personal gains. Values in education for the pupils might be cognitive gains of increased understanding and knowledge. The pupils did speak (and more rarely, wrote) of their feelings and of feelings towards others, but actions and the potential consequences of actions were central to the pupils' perspectives on their classroom and playground life.

Overall, pupils in each of the schools appeared to accept what they reported their teachers as stressing, although they did not necessarily comply with this all the time. Furthermore, only a minority of pupils accepted the importance of the desired behaviour for negative reasons such as: 'to avoid trouble' or because otherwise: 'you might get a row'. Like their teachers, the pupils were aware of the group or the social environment as a motivating force in behaving appropriately. We might speculate that for these primary school pupils, their main peer reference group was in the classroom, therefore the teachers who built up class morale and strengthened group cohesion were at the same time fostering acceptance of classroom values. It also seemed that pupils did reflect what teachers said, or perhaps were aware of what their teachers said. What they did and what they believed might be rather different from this seeming acceptance of the teacher's role in defining the boundaries of the classroom and in identifying values in education.

Summary of the study school findings

The following summary outlines the main findings emerging from in-depth studies of five Scottish primary schools. Information was gathered from staff, pupils, parents and documents, by means of a variety of formal and less formal interviews and discussions, observations and analysis of pupils' writing. This part of the study provides some insight into what appear to be the main features of values education as understood by the various members of a small number of school communities.

Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values?

- On the whole there seemed to be consensus over values and values education.
- Talking to each other appeared to be the accepted way of promoting a desired policy or desired outlook on values education.
- Parents' knowledge of values education in the school seemed to be limited to assumptions. They assumed that: 'the school carries on what we began' (*Views of a small number of parents selected by the headteachers*).
- These parents saw themselves as holding the prime responsibility for their children's development of values, not the school.

Staff perceptions of values

- The values most often discussed were expressed in rather broad terms. They were:
    - consideration for others
    - respect for others, and for property and authority
    - religious values, a religious community
    - a school community
    - work
    - pupil self-esteem
    - self-discipline
- The values seemed to fall into two groups, those seen as relevant to the individual (eg work habits, self-discipline, patience, honesty) and those seen as socially cohesive (sharing, kindness, co-operation, tolerance). This demarcation is a little blurred in that values relevant for the individual are relevant because of '*...helping [the pupil] fit into society.*'
- Teachers' rationales for values education seemed to encompass a range from minimising disruption and maximising learning to inculcation of values for life.

Fostering values

- The headteachers saw it as their task to set the tone for values in the school and ensure a policy of values education.
- Teachers generally took for granted their role in fostering values, which seemed to be integral to what went on in the classroom.
- Some teachers took a largely reactive approach to values fostering, seizing the occasion where it arose. Others appeared to be more proactive in their approach, creating as well as seizing occasions, and being aware of how aspects of the hidden curriculum such as grouping of pupils carry values messages too.
- Where there was debate and discussion as part of values education, this focused on the rationales for values (eg why should we be kind?) rather than on consideration of what values to hold.
- Most of teachers' talk in relation to the evaluation of any success in fostering values was focused on pupil behaviour.
- Evaluating success was for teachers an *ad hoc* business of collecting examples and impressions within the classroom.

Drawing together these findings then, it appears that headteachers, teachers and parents all take some responsibility for children's development of values, but it seems to be taken for granted that everyone is working towards the same objectives. Much of what is going on in values education in school is not being made explicit, either among and between members of staff, or to the pupils and their parents. The broad terms, almost clichés, which are used in any discussion on this subject are generally such that few would disagree with them, but this may leave them open to a range of different interpretations by individuals.

6 Survey findings: what the staff say

Introduction

The survey data were gathered by means of a postal questionnaire sent to a sample of teachers (those of P1, P4 and P7 pupils) and headteachers in 10% of Scottish primary schools (copies of the questionnaire are available from SCRE on request). The sample included Catholic and non-denominational schools from the state sector, and independent schools. It also included schools of a broad range of sizes, from single-teacher schools with fewer than 10 pupils to schools with 25 or more teachers and in excess of 500 pupils. The make-up of our sample allowed us to look throughout for patterns of variation in perceptions and practice according to whether a school is independent, Catholic or non-denominational, and to size of school. For questions asked of the teachers we could also look for any sign of variations relating to the stage of pupils being taught. These factors are only considered in the discussion where they are related to variations in responses given. Otherwise the reader can infer that where no differences are mentioned, none were found.

The relatively low response rate of around 40% for headteachers and 25% for teachers means that the survey findings should be treated with caution. While it may not be possible to justify a strong claim that the survey findings can be generalised, it should be noted that headteacher and teacher respondents match the overall Scottish profiles for schools and teachers. Furthermore the findings do provide a broader base in support of the more detailed investigations of the case studies. Unless or until evidence is produced to the contrary, the findings from this research can be seen as a good starting point from which to develop an understanding of what is happening in relation to values in education in primary schools in Scotland.

Which values are fostered in the school?

All teachers and headteachers were asked to identify the values being emphasised by themselves and other staff in the school. This, along with many of the questions in this survey, was presented as an open question. Most respondents listed somewhere between three and eight values. A very broad range of responses was given, but relatively few were identified by substantial numbers of the respondents. Table 6.1 shows these core values, while the full list is given at the end of the Technical Appendix.

The terms listed in Table 6.1 use the teachers' own words. A particular feature of these is that they are rather broad, umbrella terms. Many of the less frequently given responses (see list in Technical Appendix) are somewhat more specific and could be implicitly understood as part of the intention of some of these broader terms by many of the respondents. We cannot tell to what extent the terms carry overlapping or differing meanings for different respondents. For instance, caring, consideration and respect for others may all be ways of saying the same thing, or may convey subtly different ideas.

Table 6.1 *Values most often identified as being stressed within the school*

Value (based on respondents' words)	Teachers and headteachers listing % (N=293)
Caring/concern for others	36
Honesty/integrity	35
Self-esteem	35
Good manners	32
Respect others	32
Consideration for others	31
Co-operate/be helpful	30

On the whole these values were identified to a similar extent by staff from Catholic, non-denominational and independent schools. However staff from the Catholic schools were more likely to identify 'caring' as a value they stressed (56% did so) compared with staff from non-denominational (33%) and independent schools (30%). A rather smaller proportion of staff from independent schools (9%) identified 'self-esteem' as a value they stressed compared with the state sector (44% of staff from Catholic schools identified 'self-esteem' and 37% from non-denominational schools).

There were only small differences, mainly of emphasis, between the responses of teachers and headteachers. A greater proportion of the teachers included 'good manners' in their list (38%) than headteachers (23%). Conversely, a greater proportion of the headteachers (38%) included 'respect others' than teachers (29%). Overall, however, these seven values listed in Table 6.1 were the ones most often identified by teachers and headteachers, indicating a strong common rhetoric concerning what values they are fostering with primary age children. We will consider the implications of this consensus in Section 4.

These values most often identified by the teachers and headteachers responding to our questionnaire are largely ones which encourage pupils' development as social beings. They contribute to social cohesion within the school, tending to benefit the group before the individual. Only self-esteem in Table 6.1 is focused primarily on pupils as individuals, while honesty/integrity has both individual and social aspects.

A striking omission from the list of most frequently identified values is any which relate to the value of learning. This is not to say that no teachers or headteachers identified any values referring to learning. Almost 10% of the respondents identified "a positive attitude to learning" or similar among the values stressed in their schools, and smaller numbers identified such things as "discovery and enjoyment in their education", "achieving potential" and "think critically". The reasons for and implications of the identification of such relatively small numbers of values relating to learning will be considered in the light of other information later in this report.

■ Which values are fostered in the classroom?

Teachers were also asked to identify three values they had fostered with their own class in the past term. This was again an open question and the pattern of responses is shown in Table 6.2. Because each respondent could identify a maximum of only three values in

response to this question, whereas in the question about values in the school many were identifying up to eight or more, the overall number of responses to this question is rather lower. Thus the fact that one in three (33%) teachers had recently fostered 'consideration for others', 28% had recently fostered 'co-operation', and one in four (25%) had fostered 'self-esteem', adds weight to our earlier observation that there appears to be considerable consensus amongst teachers as to the values they are fostering.

Table 6.2 *Values fostered by teachers in their classrooms*

Value (based on respondents' words)	**Teachers listing % (N=191)**
Consideration for others	33
Co-operate/be helpful	28
Self-esteem	25
Honesty	21
Good manners	17
Independence	15
Caring/concern for others	11

Table 6.2 shows the seven values most often identified by teachers as having been recently fostered with their class. The list is almost identical with that in Table 6.1 although the smaller number of responses given by each teacher means that the percentages fall away more sharply in Table 6.2. 'Independence', which appears in Table 6.2 but not in Table 6.1, was the next most frequently identified value stressed in the whole school after those listed in Table 6.1 (see list in Technical Appendix), but it was not included in that table because there was a sudden drop in the numbers identifying each value at this point. 'Respect others' appeared in Table 6.1 but fell just outside the list of the most frequently identified values fostered in class as shown in Table 6.2.

Focusing now on the values fostered by teachers in their classrooms, 'independence' was more often identified by teachers of P1 pupils than by those of older pupils, and 'honesty/integrity' was less often identified by teachers of P1. There are at least two ways in which the term 'independence' was being used by teachers. One is in terms of 'learning to cope without constant support of Mum'. The other relates to the development of autonomous learning, that is 'to help children become independent thinkers'. In many cases, no elucidation of this sort was provided, so we cannot be sure what interpretation was being put on the term. Nonetheless, it is striking that only 8% of teachers of P7 pupils and 6% of teachers of P4 pupils listed independence, while 31% of teachers of P1 pupils had listed it, despite it being seen by some respondents as 'important for future in school and life' so that 'the child will begin to work with growing independence and make increasingly more mature decisions.'

However, we need to remember that these values were simply those which the teachers had recently fostered in their classrooms. Teachers were not asked to identify which values they felt were most important. It might be the case that in the early stages of the school year, settling in a new class as these teachers were, different values tend to be stressed than later in the year.

In the next section we look at the reasons teachers gave for these particular values being important. This will provide some insight into the factors which influence which values

teachers foster. We move on from this to look at how important teachers and headteachers consider values education, and for what reasons.

■ Why are these values important?

Teachers were asked, with respect to the particular values that they had identified as having been recently fostered by them in their class, why each of these values was important for the pupils or a specific pupil. The responses to this open question were grouped under a number of broad headings and the spread of responses is shown in Table 6.3. The responses sometimes included elements which meant they came under two rather than just one of the broad headings.

Table 6.3 *Why is each of these values important for your pupils?*

Focus of reason given	Teachers listing % (N=191)
Individual development	26
Social cohesion	24
Values for life	23
Maximise learning	15

There seemed to be no discernible pattern linking particular values with particular reasons for importance. Remembering that some of these statements will have been classified under more than one of the headings listed in Table 6.3, the scope of the ideas encompassed by each heading can be illustrated through the words of our respondents. The value(s) to which each comment related are shown in brackets.

'Individual development' was taken to be the thrust of such comments as:

To give each child a sense of achievement, building confidence (self-esteem)

To encourage personal attitudes of honesty (honesty)

All part of growing in mind as well as body, towards becoming responsible adults (consideration for others; responsibility; co-operation)

Comments classified as involving the promotion of 'social cohesion' included:

We have to work together (kindness)

Aids the socialisation of all children (regard for the feelings of others)

To make the class run smoothly children have to co-operate with each other on a class basis, a group basis, and an individual basis. They learn to be independent, to take turns .. and this helps to boost self-esteem (co-operation)

Under the heading 'values for life' were included comments such as:

Equipping pupils for life (friendship; consideration of others; good manners)

To be able to cope with the next phase of their lives - secondary school and beyond (self-esteem)

Helps towards taking a responsible part in the life of the community (respect for own and others property)

Individual and social elements appear to be more equally balanced here than was the case for the values themselves. However, this individual development is very often in relation to acquiring values which aid the pupil in fitting in with the group, whether this be the class, the school, or society as a whole, a point illustrated by the quotations above.

Again, comments reflecting a concern with pupils' work and learning were made less frequently than others, but as we have already intimated, there could be a number of explanations for this. The kind of comments classified under the heading 'maximise learning' included:

I feel it is important that P1 is a happy stage - to promote good learning (happiness)

Learning is much better if it is a shared experience and they can learn so much more if this sharing happens, eg constructive criticism of their classmates work (to further develop co-operation with the class)

A happy, caring environment provides for better learning (respect for own and others feelings)

A number of the quotations above are stated in a positive manner, as are such comments as:

Encouraging a positive attitude towards education (learning through enjoyment)

These are the basis of respect and positive relationships (good manners)

To enable each child to enjoy and benefit from her time at school (consideration for others)

Overall, just over 50% of the reasons teachers gave for why particular values were important were expressed in positive terms such as this. Many of the remaining comments were expressed in fairly neutral terms, but 15% of the responses were given a somewhat negative slant, generally in terms of counteracting undesirable behaviour. These included such comments as:

Lack of manners in the home (good manners)

This was done to combat aggression and intolerance of others (sharing - equipment, space, thoughts, etc)

The class were very self-centred (thinking of others)

Implicit in many of these rather negative comments was the notion that there is one correct view of the world, and that those whose values differ are wrong, or have no values at all. Whilst there is undoubtedly a strong case for defining some behaviours as unacceptable in a classroom situation, there is a risk if one becomes too attached to the idea that a certain set of values should be held by all, that one will be failing to respect others' right to develop and adhere to a different set of values.

Just three teachers (<1%) made any mention of reasons focusing on helping pupils to be more aware of the need for values. All of these were teachers of P7 pupils, and in all cases the value which had been identified was 'the need for rules'.

To make pupils more aware of acceptable constraints and the reasons why they exist

Enabled the children to see the need for wider rules in society so that we can consider each other in all things

Work on rules of school, community and family - Why have rules?

There were other occasional references to similar approaches in different sections of the questionnaire, most particularly as methods by which values were demonstrated and fostered, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter. However, overall only a handful of respondents made any mention of helping pupils to become actively involved in developing their own ideas about values.

■ Why is 'values education' important?

As well as asking the teachers about their reasons for fostering specific values in their classrooms, teachers and headteachers were asked to what extent and why values education was important to them. Not everyone answered this question, but of those who did, 60% said it was 'important' or 'very important'. It was regarded as 'an integral part of education' by 16%, 'vital' by 13%, and 3% went so far as to call it '*the* priority in education'.

Of rather more interest are the reasons they gave. The spread of responses, grouped under the same broad headings as before, is shown in Table 6.4. A number of respondents gave an extended response which contributed to more than one of these headings, and was coded accordingly.

Table 6.4 *Reasons for values education being important*

Focus of reason given	Teachers and headteachers listing % (N=259)
Values for life	48
Maximise learning	17
Individual development	13
Social cohesion	10

The proportions of teachers and headteachers responding match each other and those given in Table 6.4 extremely closely, except that headteachers put less weight on the socially cohesive benefits of values education (only 3% of them gave such reasons as compared with 15% of teachers).

It appears that reasons relating to 'individual development' and 'social cohesion' figure less prominently when teachers are considering the role of values in education as a whole than they do in the context of the importance of specific values. Reasons relating to 'values for life' on the other hand, are identified by a considerably greater number of teachers in connection with values in education as a whole.

This question about the importance of values education had quite a low response rate - 17% of respondents had left it blank. Whilst the question did appear near the end of a fairly long questionnaire, the fact that only 6% and 2% of respondents left the subsequent two questions blank indicates that this is not the explanation. It seems likely that this indicates an area which is particularly difficult to make explicit, even for teachers who have given thought to the idea of values in education.

How are these values fostered?

As well as being asked which values they foster and why, teachers and headteachers were also asked '.. in what ways do adults in the school demonstrate and foster these values?' Table 6.5 summarises the open responses given under a number of headings. Typically, individual responses identified three or four different methods.

Table 6.5 *In what ways do adults in the school demonstrate and foster these values?*

Methods used, (based on respondents' words)	Teachers' and headteachers' listing % (N=297)
Example/role model	70
Promoting the positive/praise	25
Happy atmosphere/good relationships	24
Teaching scheme/curriculum	21
Draw attention often/incidents	18
Pupils respected as individuals	18
Consistency of approach	18
Staff respect/good attitude	15
Variety of classroom-based approaches	12
School get-togethers eg assemblies	11

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of these responses is how many of them are methods which use informal approaches and the hidden curriculum, rather than formally planned activities. The only difference of note between staff from Catholic, non-denominational and independent schools, was that a considerably greater proportion of staff in the Catholic schools (44%) gave responses which could be categorised as 'staff treat each other with respect' than staff from non-denominational (13%) or independent schools (7%). However, many of the responses categorised as 'example/role model' in Table 6.5 used those precise words and no more. We do not know how many of the other methods listed were implicit in such responses.

Where a teaching scheme was specified, this was usually religious and moral education with occasional mention of personal and social development, environmental studies, health education and topic work. Interestingly, the respondents from Catholic schools were no more likely to list religious and moral education as a method for fostering values than were those from other schools. This suggests that, despite the central role of formal religious instruction in these schools, when it comes to fostering values informal methods play a key part.

Responses coded as classroom-based approaches encompassed a range of ideas, which are exemplified by quotations from the responses:

> *Setting up problem solving that must be achieved by working together. Teachers are involved in team teaching to demonstrate their working together.* (Teacher P7)
>
> *Discussion. Topic work. Listening. Doing* (Headteacher)
>
> *Role play. Literature* (Headteacher)

We gained more insight into the methods of fostering values being used in the classroom from a question to the teachers asking them to specify, with respect to the specific values they had fostered in their class recently, what methods they had used. The four methods they were to choose from were: planned curriculum segment, classroom management/ hidden curriculum, extra-curricular activities, and building on incidents. More than one method could be identified as being used with each value. Table 6.6 shows the percentages of teachers saying they had used each method.

Table 6.6 *Methods teachers use to foster values*

Methods listed on questionnaire	Teachers indicating use % (N=191)
Classroom management/hidden curriculum	84
Building on incidents	84
Planned curriculum segment	59
Extra-curricular activities	31

From this table it can be seen that the balance of methods used by teachers to foster values with their classes again shows a bias towards the informal. Classroom organisation, the hidden curriculum, and building on incidents as they arise, were used rather more than were formally planned curriculum activities. The high level of use of incidents as the catalyst for fostering values indicates an emphasis on real-life examples, as opposed to considering values in the abstract or in artificially created contexts. The markedly lower use of extra-curricular activities as a medium through which to foster values may reflect the limited nature of these in many schools rather than limitations on their usefulness for the purpose.

There were some differences in the proportions of teachers and headteachers identifying the various methods of fostering values listed in Table 6.5. Nonetheless, taken overall, both groups make more reference to methods which employ informal approaches and the hidden curriculum. It is interesting that the headteachers more often listed formal approaches than did teachers, although the differences in proportions are not great. 'Teaching scheme/curriculum' was identified by 24% of headteachers and 18% of teachers. 'Variety of classroom-based approaches' was identified by 14% of headteachers and 10% of teachers. This adds another dimension to the evidence already presented indicating that teachers favour informal approaches to fostering values within their classrooms and elsewhere.

A greater proportion of the headteachers (31%) identified the kinds of methods categorised as 'Happy atmosphere/good relationships' in Table 6.5 than did teachers (19%). Typical comments included under this heading were:

> *Friendly smiling welcome for visitors, children and other staff members* (Teacher P7)

> *All staff, teaching and ancillary, co-operate well together with parents and children. There is a happy atmosphere where all do their best for the school* (Headteacher)

Conversely, smaller proportions of headteachers than teachers identified various of the other informal methods. 'Consistency of approach', 'drawing attention often/incidents', and 'pupils respected as individuals' were all listed by 22% of teachers, but by only between 11% and 13% of headteachers. The following three quotations illustrate each of these categories in turn.

> *Consistent staff approach to behaviour in all situations - teaching and ancillary* (Headteacher)

> *Values are constantly highlighted as incidents arise* (Teacher P1/2/3)

> *Children's comments are taken into consideration in class and school* (Teacher P1)

Headteachers also more often listed comments grouped as 'Parents and others welcomed into school' than did teachers (16% as opposed to 6%). When combined with other responses concerning links with parents and the community, such as:

Working in partnership with parents and the church (RC Headteacher)

Through the curriculum and events in the school and through involvement with the community (Headteacher)

Responses that fell into this category were given by 32% of headteachers and only 11% of teachers. This probably reflects an understandable difference of focus between teachers and headteachers, on activities centred on their classrooms by the former, and on a broader view of events by the latter. This interpretation is also supported by the evidence presented in the next section.

■ Where are these values fostered?

Teachers and headteachers were asked the open question, 'Where do you think pupils learn most about values in your school?' The responses fell into a number of categories. Table 6.7 shows the percentage of teachers and headteachers identifying each of these. Some respondents identified as many as four different categories, although most identified only one or two.

Table 6.7 *Where do you think pupils learn most about values in your school ?*

Where values learning occurs in school	Teachers listing % (N=181)	Headteachers listing % (N=110)
Classroom/class teachers	77	54
Day-to-day interactions	30	42
Formal curriculum/assemblies	29	40
Playground/dinner time	21	25
Throughout	12	18
Peers	11	10
Extra-curricular activities	6	8

Here, there is yet again a difference in emphasis but not substance between the responses of the teachers and headteachers. In this instance the difference is not in terms of the rank order of their responses, but in terms of the spread of responses across the different options.

The fact that both heads and teachers believe most values education happens in the classroom setting provides a context in which to understand the consistency between the whole-school and classroom perspectives on the key values being fostered. However, it is in relation to this response that a particular difference in emphasis between teachers and headteachers emerges.

The teachers as a body show a strong common understanding of the classroom as the main focus of values learning in school. However, the headteachers' responses are more broadly spread between the classroom and other parts of the school, both in the informal context of day-to-day interactions with staff and other adults, and in more formal settings, particularly assemblies. With respect to this latter context, staff in Catholic and independent schools were more likely than those in non-denominational schools to identify assemblies as an occasion where values are fostered.

Do the pupils acquire these values?

Earlier in this chapter, in connection with the methods of fostering values favoured by teachers, we indicated that their preference for informal methods might have implications for the assessment of values acquisition. Teachers were asked whether there were any ways in which they could judge the success of their fostering of values in their classes. Of the 191 teachers responding to this survey, only six said there were not any ways in which they could judge success, and a further three gave no response to this question. It would thus appear that teachers do not identify this as a particular problem area.

The teachers were asked to specify how they judge success. Their responses often identified two or three methods. A summary of their responses using headings derived from the teachers' own words is given in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8 *Ways teachers judge success in fostering values*

Teachers' descriptions of methods	Teachers listing % (N=181)
By monitoring/observing pupil behaviour	55
By how pupils interact with others	19
Through pupil motivation/standards of work	17
Change in pupils' attitude to each other	16
By how happy pupils are/good atmosphere	14
Success of group activities/	12
Comments from other people	12
By what pupils say/write	11
Through discussions with pupils	9
Reduction in number of 'incidents'	8
How pupils play together in the playground	8

These responses indicate that teachers' main focus when judging success is on pupils' behaviour, either in general or specific aspects of it. Only a relatively small number actually specified that it was changes in behaviour that they were looking for, but this was implicit in many of the other comments. A particular focus of the teachers was the pupils' interactions with others, in class, around school generally, and in the playground, echoing the strong emphasis on values that encourage social cohesion and the benefit of the group. Some focus on individual development is inherent in responses mentioning motivation, standards of work, and what pupils say and write.

Pupils' feelings are implicitly being taken account of in responses mentioning their happiness and the atmosphere in the class, and their attitudes to each other. In as far as it is possible to tell from the data we have, the cognitive dimension of acquiring values is taken little account of, either implicitly or explicitly, in the methods teachers have identified for judging success of their fostering of values.

A further small but interesting category were responses which referred to comments by others as being an indicator of success. Whether this indicates a lack of confidence on the part of those teachers in their own judgement and hence a dissatisfaction with the available methods for judging success we cannot tell. Perhaps it indicates a more open ear to indications of effective values acquisition, and a way into what pupils are doing when

they are out of sight. Pupils' development of values is a long-term process but a more impartial view may be welcomed for its contribution towards building a picture of a pupils' progress in this development.

With respect to values at whole school level, both teachers and headteachers were asked 'Do you feel that the pupils are aware of these values?'. They could respond 'Yes', 'No' or 'Not certain'. Not one of the 310 respondents answered 'No'. Of the headteachers, 93% said 'Yes', 4% said 'Not certain', and 3% gave no response. Of the teachers, 93% said 'Yes', 6% said 'Not certain', and only 1% gave no response. Teachers and headteachers thus seem confident overall that the pupils are at least aware of the values the school is attempting to foster.

They were also asked to expand on their answers. Table 6.9 summarises the responses given under a number of broad headings. Individual responses might contribute to more than one of these headings.

Table 6.9 *How teachers and headteachers tell pupils are aware of school's values*

Methods (based on respondents' words)	Teachers listing % (N=141)	Headteachers listing % (N=93)
Values are constantly reinforced	38	59
How the pupils behave	27	23
Pupils aware but don't always act accordingly	22	12
Through discussions with pupils	17	15
Pupils have copy of, or know, code of conduct	4	10

It is striking how far down this list 'discussions with pupils' comes, and how relatively small the percentages identifying this method were when it is the only category of response which taps directly into the pupils' awareness. Even then, at least some of the responses under this heading were really describing discussions which followed the teacher's agenda, rather than occasions when the pupils were being listened to. The following quotations illustrate each of these two approaches:

> *The children know what the expectations are. At the beginning of term we discuss ground rules and the reasons why.* (Teacher P7)

> *I know that they are aware of the values in my own class. The children are encouraged to express and discuss their feelings in these areas.* (Teacher P4)

■ Is there an agreed values stance within schools?

From the findings outlined thus far concerning which values are fostered in schools it appears that there are some variations in emphasis between teachers and headteachers, but a high level of consensus as to the substance of values education in primary schools. In our survey we also collected information about teachers' and headteachers' perceptions of the level of agreement in their schools, and about how this had been reached.

Teachers and headteachers were asked whether, in their opinion, there was an agreed values stance in their school. The vast majority (81% of teachers and 88% of headteachers) thought that there was. Only 7% of teachers and 6% of headteachers answered 'No'. Slightly more (11% of teachers and 6% of headteachers) expressed some doubts by answering 'Not certain'. Some of the teachers and headteachers who said they did not agree on values or were not certain about agreement were from the same schools, that is

they agreed that they disagreed. However, some of those who said that there was or might be a lack of agreement about values in their schools were lone voices: other staff who responded from their schools reported that there was an agreed values stance. These varying degrees of perceived agreement between staff might have considerable implications in terms of sending mixed messages to the pupils in these schools.

Those respondents who said there was no agreement or that they were not certain that there was agreement about values in their schools were asked to give reasons for their answer. Of the thirty six teachers (19%), eleven gave reasons along the lines that other things had taken priority. Ten said that the issue had not been explicitly addressed - it seemed to be taken for granted, and nine said there were personal differences between staff. Three teachers gave being new in school as the reason for their uncertainty about an agreed values stance between staff, and the remaining three teachers each identified a different reason: poor whole-school liaison, lack of time, and major changes in the school.

Only twelve (10%) of the headteachers gave reasons for a lack of or uncertainty over agreement between staff on their values stance. Again, priority being given to other things (given by 4 heads) and not explicitly addressing the issue of agreement over a values stance (given by 5 heads) were the main reasons identified. The remaining three headteachers each identified different reasons; lack of time, the need to compromise with parents and society, and being new to the school.

It can be deduced from the nature of most of these responses and the small number of them, that achieving agreement over the values to be fostered within school was not perceived as a problem for the majority of staff. We asked further questions of those who felt there was an agreed values stance in their schools, in order to try to build up a picture of the key factors which had contributed to that agreement.

How has agreement been reached?

Those teachers and headteachers who felt there was an agreed values stance in their schools were asked to indicate all of the approaches from a given list which had contributed towards the development of this stance. Table 6.10 shows the percentage of teachers and headteachers indicating each of the approaches.

Table 6.10 *How has an agreed values stance developed?*

Approaches listed on questionnaire	Staff saying contributed to development: % teachers and headteachers (N=310)
Informal discussion together in staffroom	76
Formal discussion at staff meetings	73
Staff development eg in-service, PAT	66
The school development plan	64
It's the kind of people we are (shared background, profession etc)	57
5-14 programme guidelines	56
Passed from the headteacher down	56
Discussions with parents (at PTA, School Board etc)	56
Discussed when new staff join	46
Senior management discussions	44
Religious beliefs/doctrines	38
SOED ethos indicators	35

The respondents were then asked to identify which two of the above approaches had been most important for their school. On the whole the things identified by individuals as being most important were also those identified as being used by the greatest numbers of people. Discussions between staff, informal and formal, were most often identified as being the most important approach for a school; slightly more teachers (39%) than headteachers (34%) thought formal meetings important, with comparable differences for informal meetings (38% headteachers, 42% teachers). This reflects the central role that discussion takes amongst the usually quite small numbers of teachers on a primary school's staff.

School- and teacher-centred development, through such media as PAT, in-service training and the school development plan were thought most important by between 19% and 25% of respondents. Direction from the headteacher was identified as being important by 19% of teachers, 17% of headteachers. Centrally-produced documents were rather less often identified. The 5-14 development programme guidelines were identified as an important influence by around 5% of respondents and the SOED's ethos indicators were identified by around 4%.

Discussions with parents, in formal settings such as the PTA or School Board meetings, and the influence of religion were considered key approaches for the school by around 15% of headteachers, but by only 9% and 7% of teachers respectively. Most of the remaining options were identified as being most important for their school by only a handful of respondents.

'It's the kind of people we are (shared background, profession etc)' was identified as an important influence by 20% of teachers but only 9 % of headteachers. The importance of personal qualities in determining primary staff's outlook on values in education is further supported by the responses to a later question. Teachers and headteachers were asked to identify which of a list of possible influences had affected their views on values education. The proportions of teachers and headteachers identifying each option as one of the two most important influences on their views of values education are shown in Table 6.11.

Table 6.11 *Which of these have most affected your views of values education?*

Influences listed on questionnaire	Selected as one of two most important by: % teachers (N=191)	% headteachers(N=119)
How I was brought up	73	60
Being a parent myself	45	39
Present colleagues	23	14
My own religious beliefs	19	33
My own schooling	14	8
People I have worked with in the past	11	19
My own political views	3	8
My partner	3	5
Friends	2	<1
Tutors at college	3	<1
Peers at college	1	0

Teachers were also asked whether they themselves had been involved in the process of reaching a whole-school values stance. Only slightly more than half (53%) answered 'Yes'. Of the reminder, 26% said 'No' and 21% gave no response to this question. Those who answered 'Yes' were given space to specify in what ways they had been involved. The two key methods identified were the school development plan, mentioned by 35 teachers (18% of total) and formal discussion at staff meetings, mentioned by 27 teachers (14% of total.)

There is an interesting discrepancy here between the proportions of teachers identifying formal discussion at staff meetings as a method which has been used to reach an agreed stance (72%) and the number who say they have been involved at all in developing an agreed stance (53%). Yet fewer teachers (only 14%) actually identify these discussions specifically as a method by which they have been involved. This suggests that a lot of the agreement here is perhaps better understood as an absence of disagreement, with many teachers sitting in staff meetings where these issues are discussed but taking no active part.

Headteachers were asked what they saw as their role in the development of values education in their schools at present. The responses to this open question were categorised under a number of headings, and are summarised in Table 6.12. Individual responses identified between one and three elements in their role descriptions.

Table 6.12 *Headteachers' role in developing values education*

Role (based on headteachers' words)	Headteachers listing % (N=108)
Leader (by example/role model)	45
Implement/monitor 'policies'	37
Raise awareness, often through assemblies	15
Member of team with staff	12
Establish/maintain favourable ethos	12

There was a considerable variation in the views of leadership of the headteachers responding to our survey. Many just put 'leader' but others indicated particular situations where their leadership was needed, such as the following:

> *Strong leadership able to motivate staff. ..able to raise greater awareness through information given to school board and PTA as well as to children*

Others seemed to feel the need to clarify the role of leader in ways such as:

> *A leader. I believe that the head does set the tone to a large extent but I would say the role of leader is no more important than the other participants - ie one needs co-operation and collaboration to make any difference*

Responses included under the heading implement/monitor policies included the interpretation of policies as formal written documents such as:

> *Formalisation of work into a policy. .. Linking to 5-14, eg Personal and Social Development*

However, they also included a more informal interpretation such as that of the headteacher whose role was :

> *To co-ordinate the ideas put forward by the staff and to implement them*

Teachers and headteachers were specifically asked whether the values stance in their school had been formalised in a written policy. This was clearly a matter about which there was considerable uncertainty, since 21% of respondents left this question blank. Of those

who did respond, 128 (41% of all respondents) thought there was a written policy and 116 (37% of all respondents) thought there was not. Those saying there was a written policy often qualified their response by saying it formed part of a broader policy, such as the school development plan or a discipline policy, or by saying that a policy was in the process of being written.

■ Is agreement shared with parents and community?

Teachers and headteachers were asked whether they thought that, generally speaking, the parents or carers of their pupils shared the values being fostered in class and school. Overall, 90% thought they did share them, and only 10% thought they did not. The teachers alone were even more positive, with 95% thinking their values were shared with the home and only 5% thinking they were not. Headteachers were considerably more likely to indicate that the parents as a whole did not share the values of the school where the school had more than 23% of their pupils on free school meals (the proportion of pupils throughout Scotland entitled to free school meals in January 1994), with 23 % saying this and only 77% saying the parents did share their values. This is an indicator, albeit rather crude, of the interplay between home background and values in the school.

The influence of the home on pupils' development of values was considered significant by 96% of respondents. In a number of cases this influence was not seen as being entirely positive, although, as the figures above indicate, in most schools it is only a few if any of the parents whom the teachers feel have different values from the school. As one teacher wrote:

> *Home background and environment has a significant, even greater influence on the pupils, especially when that influence is more violent and aggressive.*

Other out of school influences that our respondents felt were significant to pupils' development of values included pupils' own friends, TV and the media generally, Church, clubs such as Cubs and Brownies and the community and local environment.

As an indicator of the kind of relationships they have with parents, teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they had each of a list of types of contact with them. Table 6.13 shows the percentages of teachers indicating that they had each type of contact.

Table 6.13 *Types of contact between class teachers and parents*

Types of contact listed on questionnaire	Teachers indicating % (N=191)
Parents' nights	100
They are contacted when there is a problem	100
They can make an appointment at any time	97
The door is always open for parents	96
They help on trips/at school events	95
Casual, at the beginning and end of school	72
Through the PTA/PFA	66
At School Board meetings	42
When things are going well	39
They help out in my class	38
I live here so see people around the place	26

The first three of the categories in Table 6.13 are fairly formal and standard types of contact. The next two categories, 'the door is always open for parents' and 'they help on trips' were both indicated by the vast majority of teachers. However we have no indication of the amount of involvement of this type occurs. More informative is the finding that 72% of teachers report that they have casual contact with parents at the beginning and end of school, and this is a likely indicator of good relationships between these parents and teachers. Nonetheless, this leaves a little more than a quarter of the teachers not apparently engaging in this kind of contact. Perhaps the 38% of teachers indicating that parents help out in their classrooms is the best measure of involvement of parents with the day to day life of the school, which is most likely to result in a shared understanding of the development of the pupils.

Headteachers were also asked whether there were any ways in which the school tried to interest or involve parents and carers in values education. The open responses to this question were grouped under a number of headings and are summarised in Table 6.14.

Table 6.14 *Ways schools involve parents in values education*

Form of involvement (based on headteachers' words)	**Headteachers listing % (N=108)**
Participating in class, trips, at assemblies etc	41
Discussion of school aims, eg at parents nights	27
Through school handbook, newsletter etc	24
Through PTA/ School Board	23
Informed/ involved in eg discipline policy	21
Parent workshops	15
No direct involvement	12
Religious celebrations/programme	8
Parents of 'problem' pupils	7

The headings under which the headteachers' responses have been grouped on the whole indicate a view of a lower level of parental involvement than the teachers' responses shown in Table 6.13. However, the focus of the question may have influenced the kinds of responses that headteachers gave, and they may not, for example, have seen the casual contact that many teachers have with parents at the beginning and end of school as being relevant here. A few examples of the range of responses included under the first heading give an idea of the variety of approaches being taken. The responses often included aspects which fell under more than one of the headings shown in Table 6.14, such as:

> *Parent helpers on a regular basis, both in the classroom and doing photocopying, etc. Opinions of parents sought (and listened to, I hope!). PTA run by parents. Some events (parties, activity afternoons) organised by parents*

Some headteachers made specific mention of the openness of their school to parents, in a variety of ways:

> *'Open door' policy encourages parents and teachers to discuss problems immediately. Parental involvement in school activities as much as possible*

> *Parental Involvement Policy/Parental Involvement Co-ordinator (Parent)*

Most of the other categories of response in Table 6.14 involve rather more formality and distance, on what some would call traditional lines, such as the following head:

Our School Handbook sets out our ethos and the fact that we maintain traditional values of Scottish Education with the emphasis on numeracy and literacy based on a broad-based curriculum.

The 12% who said there were no direct ways in which parents were involved in the values education of the school, combined with the 9% who gave no response to this question is an interesting result in the light of the fact that 96% of the respondents stated that home and family had a significant influence on their pupils' development of values. Many of those who regard home as an important influence on pupils' values are not, according to these findings, actively involving parents in this aspect of the pupils' education as part of their approach.

Summary of survey findings

The main findings emerging from this survey of a sample of teachers (of P1, P4 and P7 pupils) and headteachers in Scottish primary schools summarised below but the reader is reminded to treat them with some caution given the response rate (40% for headteachers and 25% for teachers). However, the spread of respondents matched the national profile of Scottish primary staff and their evidence has some validity.

Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values?

- There was considerable consensus among the primary teachers and headteachers responding to our survey over a core set of values they were fostering with their pupils.
- Achieving agreement over the values to be fostered in school was not perceived as a problem for the majority of respondents to our survey.
- The majority also thought that the parents and carers of their pupils shared the values being fostered in class and school.

Staff perceptions of values

- The values most often identified were rather broad, overlapping terms. They were:
    - caring/concern for others
    - honesty/integrity
    - self-esteem
    - good manners
    - respect others
    - consideration for others
    - co-operate/be helpful.
- The majority of these values encourage pupils' development as social beings.
- Reasons relating to individual development and social cohesion were most often given by teachers for fostering specific values in class.
- Reasons relating to the importance of developing 'values for life' were most often given in support of values education as a whole.

Fostering values

- Headteachers saw their role as including leadership, often by setting an example, implementing policies, raising awareness, and establishing and maintaining a favourable school ethos.

- Methods identified as being used for demonstrating and fostering values within the school and the classroom were more often based on informal approaches and the hidden curriculum, than on formal methods.
- Both headteachers and teachers indicated that they believe most values education happens in the classroom, although places such as playground and dinner hall were also identified. Home and community were seen as important too, perhaps more influential than school.
- Teachers' main focus is on pupils' behaviour when judging the success of their fostering of values.
- Teachers and headteachers seem confident overall that pupils are aware of the values the school is attempting to foster, even if they do not always try or succeed in holding to them.

Drawing together the survey findings, it appears that primary school staff in Scotland have a broadly similar understanding of values education, although the vagueness of the terms used suggests possibly a greater variation of interpretation than is apparent. The values fostered tend to encourage pupils' development as social beings, especially so as to fit in to the social context of school. Whilst long-term aims of inculcating 'values for life' were expressed, most of the responses indicated a more short-term outlook, focusing on pupil behaviour for example rather than on promoting debate and discussion which might help pupils to develop their own values stance. This reflects the teachers' preference for using informal methods to demonstrate and foster values, eg setting an example by their behaviour. Staff recognise that home and community have an important influence on pupils' development of values, but there is only limited liaison with parents over this aspect of their children's education.

7 Reflections

We cannot let children simply grow into morally mature adults in this very complex world. There is a great deal they need to be taught. (Pring, 1984)

One of the aims of this research project is to raise awareness of the ways in which values education takes place, in particular in the context of Scottish primary schools. What emerges is a picture of values education based on indistinct consensus among teachers and headteachers. In this study we have only been able to skim the surface of what is a complex and pervasive part of the activities of schools. The survey in particular has given us insight only into what practitioners think and say about values education, not what they are actually doing. In this chapter we pause to reflect on, and pose questions about, issues emerging from the research before pulling together the main conclusions in the final chapter.

■ Are values fostered at school relevant to other aspects of life?

Teaching is an inescapably moral activity. Part of being a teacher is about representing and passing on the values of society. (It is significant that it is easier to dismiss a teacher on the grounds of moral impropriety than for incompetence.) Teaching, especially of the very young, involves a complex blending of personal and professional life and standards.

Schools are learning organisations and teachers and headteachers therefore tend to emphasise values which are necessary to operate successfully as a member of a class or school with externally determined goals. Children are encouraged to be 'good pupils' which may not always coincide with the values necessary to survive in the world at large. Teachers and headteachers are therefore to an extent using values education to control behaviour. To what extent are the values promoted in school to do with other aspects of life where children and adults have to face conflicting demands and pressures?

■ Can values education be planned?

Much of values education occurs informally in the primary school, and while this may be an appropriate method, this need not happen in an *ad hoc* way, but can be planned for. Are there some values which can be 'taught' in a planned way through specific curriculum areas and are there others which should only be fostered through informal methods - in an *ad hoc* or planned way? Or are the two approaches complementary, with informal incidents providing practical examples to explore values expounded more formally? Certainly there should be some consistency in the messages that pupils are receiving and the ways in which pupils are expected to engage with their own development. This requires recognition of uncertainty, ambiguity and potential conflict as well as moving to consensus on the values current in our society. There is also a need for evidence that pupils' understanding has been enhanced. As with much school experience, the extent to which the values education they receive at school remains relevant for pupils beyond the context of school is not clear.

How can members of a school cope with conflicting values?

Pupils are not the only people who may find they are in situations involving conflicting values - such as telling the truth and respecting a teacher on the one hand and on the other wanting to be loyal to the friend who started a fight in the playground. Adults battle with conflicting values all their lives. Further study could be made of values education which potentially put the teacher in embarrassing or authority eroding positions with which (s)he has difficulty in dealing.

Inevitably, mixed messages are sometimes transmitted by adults to pupils. The whole hidden curriculum is concerned with what actually happens rather than the ideal scenario and yet values are concerned with principles of operation as much as actual behaviour. This raises questions about the extent to which teachers recognise and have support in coping with the mixed messages they may be transmitting. Furthermore, how do the pupils deal with mixed messages?

This study has described some of the ways in which staff perceive the values being supported by the school as a whole and by themselves in their own classrooms, and here there remain some dilemmas. Can (and even should) agreement about values be reached, for *all* staff in the school? If so, then how could this be achieved? Should the context of the school affect definitions of values? If so, then in what ways? Furthermore, will agreement allow all staff to take on authority for values education? This seems essentially part of professional responsibility. There is really no possibility of opting out given the ubiquitous nature of values education, where ultimately everything that happens in a school is fostering values.

How can values education be monitored and evaluated?

There are tools available to schools which could be used for developing values education. We discussed briefly in Chapter 1 the way that values received explicit mention in various parts of the documentation relating to the 5-14 development programme. The school development plan is another channel through which to address values education. As Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) put it:

> The distinctive feature of a development plan is that it brings together, in an overall plan, national and LEA policies and initiatives, the school's aims and values, its existing achievements and its needs for development.

The Scottish Office Education Department (SOED) have produced ethos indicators as part of their support materials for school development planning. Ethos is regarded as a key area requiring evaluation both at the whole school level and at the class level. The kinds of things addressed by the ethos indicators include the relationships of staff, pupils and parents with each other. For example, the ways headteacher and staff interact may have a bearing on how staff interact with their pupils. The SCCC has also produced a series of publications to encourage schools to address the issue of values in education, starting with the discussion document *Values in Education* (SCCC, 1991).

Although teachers in this study were able to discuss and report how they tackled values education, this tended to be at the level of generality and did not indicate a particular theory of values development which would provide a framework for their fostering values. They were confident that they were doing it but were not very clear about how they were doing it. Particular teaching methods may, for example, result in different outcomes for pupils or it may be more effective to foster particular values by different methods. This project has not investigated how pupils may acquire values at different stages; it has concentrated

on teachers' assumptions and perceptions of values development and what *they* think they do rather than either on what they actually do or what and how children learn. Is there a pattern in methods used and pupils acquiring values which last beyond school or not? There is considerable scope for further study in these areas.

What is apparent from the project is that it is difficult to gauge the effectiveness of values education. Behaviours become so closely linked with values that they may even stand as surrogates for values. Is this an effective approach to 'assessing' values as a whole, or is it only appropriate for certain behaviours and/or values? We found that values education is not an area regularly monitored (or even discussed explicitly) by all teachers. Partly this is to do with the language for discourse - a point we come back to later. It may also be a reflection of initial and inservice teacher education programmes. It would be interesting to uncover teachers' views on their preparation for values education and what more they would want to help them be effective values educators.

What contribution do parents make to values education?

While schools have an important role in all aspects of children's education, parents are ultimately responsible for the development of their young children's values. How can they participate in the development of their children's values at school? This could be one of the most difficult areas to investigate especially when home and school values could differ to some extent for each child. We found that teachers thinking about values education seemed to be operating with a view of their pupils that was rather more collective than individual. Parents, on the other hand, are concerned with their children as individuals rather than as members of a class or school. 'Independence' and 'autonomy' for them may have different connotations from that of primary school staff. Whereas the latter are concerned (necessarily) with working within groups, parents may feel there is a lack of emphasis in school on the individuality of their children - something which parents can be expected to value dearly. Here is certainly an area for exploration. It may be worth noting here that doing a similar study in nursery settings may not have produced such a group oriented outcome (cf Holligan, 1994; Powney *et al*, 1995). It would be interesting to re-analyse conversations and observations collected in other projects in other sectors of education for different age groups. Such re-analysis would focus on what people say about values when talking about other aspects of education.

One could go further in relation to parental views. What do they see as their role? What do they know about 'values education' in school? How much do they want to know about it and what part can school boards and parent groups play in developing a school's values education policy and practices?

Can there be a more precise language for discussing values?

One of major difficulties emerging from this study is that there is no precise language of discourse in use for values education. For us as researchers, it presented a major challenge. Where it was possible to seek clarification in interviews, we found our understandings did not always match those of interviewees, and in the one-way medium of written communication we had no way of checking whether one teacher's interpretation of 'respect for others' was the same or different to another's. We have tried to incorporate into this report some examples of the language commonly used by teachers which could be built on by other investigators working towards a common language away from clichés and all-embracing terms. Certainly, for there to be improved communication on values education it seems important that a more precise use of language be developed.

8 In conclusion

Whilst we have tried to remain open to whatever understandings of values education others offered throughout this study, we needed a conceptual framework to provide some structure in which to place the information we gathered. This we derived from a broad reading of the literature in the field of values summarised in chapter 1. As Brown (1992) said:

> *Observers are not, of course, unbiased; they bring values and prejudices to their work and so 'see' what they choose to see. The most important implication of this is the need to make explicit their underlying assumptions and theories so that biases may be taken into account.*

This is particularly important when attempting to understand other people's values so it is apposite here to restate briefly the conceptual framework with which we approached this study. In this framework, values:

- include, but go beyond, the religious and moral areas of belief; 'values' refers also to other aspects of how our lives are sustained, organised and experienced
- may engage our cognition, emotions and behaviour
- may be expressed at two different levels: fundamental and contextual.

It may be useful at this point also to restate what we mean by the expression 'values education'. Values education may be understood in a broad sense to mean all aspects of the process by which teachers (and other adults) transmit values to pupils. This is the interpretation on which we have based our study, and it encompasses all the formal, and informal means by which values may be transmitted in schools. Values education may at times be used as a label for a specified programme of activity, such as religious and moral education curricula. For this reason there are those, notably in the context of Scottish education, the Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC), who prefer to refer to the broader interpretation as values *in* education. The main point to hold in mind in relation to this study is that, whatever the expression used, we are interested in the broad view of values education.

In this final chapter key findings are drawn together from the two parts of the research project, the case studies in five primary schools and the postal survey of a sample of primary teachers and headteachers. What is particularly evident is a lack of controversy among practitioners about values education. The discussion focuses in turn on each of the following themes which emerged from the research:

- Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values?
- Staff perceptions of values
- Fostering values
- Complexities of researching values

Schools as a context: are there shared, even 'fundamental' values?

Scotland is a small nation, it may be easy to assume that the majority of people will share common aims and values in the field of education and beyond. Nonetheless, the population is becoming increasingly diverse and pluralistic and this fact may not always be duly recognised. Most primary teachers in Scotland have been educated themselves in the Scottish system, and have therefore been exposed to its particular values. The need for GTC registration to teach in the Scottish state system helps to ensure this.

However, this homogeneity of background and outlook can lead to a tendency not to question the assumptions underlying all that one is doing, to a lack of consideration for the ways in which gradual changes in society may require a change of approach, or at least a return to first principles to see what is still appropriate in new circumstances. This study found considerable evidence to suggest such a state of stasis, of carrying on as before without question, in the field of values in Scottish primary education.

Our research questions included:

> Do teachers agree (a) about the kinds of values to be taught and (b) the teaching approaches to be used? By what processes is such agreement reached? If there is no agreement, what prevents consensus emerging?

In most of the schools from which we gathered evidence there was a general agreement among the staff as a whole about the values they were trying to foster. Where the subject had been explicitly addressed, this agreement was reached largely through discussion. For many, any discussion and explicit agreement seemed more to serve as a process of confirmation and legitimation for the teachers of what they were already doing, rather than a debate about the issues. In the case studies it was found that those teachers with a strong religious commitment, most of whom were in the denominational school, were far more certain of the legitimacy of their role in inculcating values for life.

We investigated the views of staff in Catholic, non-denominational and (for the survey only) independent schools. Staff from all these seemed to share a similar understanding about values education. Teachers on the whole appeared to feel that values education was 'part of the job', although the case studies findings hinted that teachers do question their right or ability to tackle personal issues with pupils. This might be because many teachers seemed also to regard fostering of values as inseparable from themselves, 'part of me'; personal values and 'school values' are hard to disentangle. There was some evidence from the case studies that there were differing levels of awareness and ability to articulate values issues between different teachers. No clear reasons for these variations emerged from the data. While teachers do regard values education as part of their job, they feel that parents have the ultimate responsibility for their children's development.

With respect to parents and other influences on pupils, our research sought to find answers to the questions: Have the schools involved parents in values education? If so in what ways? If not, why not? and Is the broader community involved in any way? The evidence we obtained tended to suggest that there was on the whole only broad and general communication between schools and parents about what was happening in terms of values education. The main forms of contact between schools and parents were the brief, informal contacts as pupils were fetched and carried, and general information in newsletters and school handbooks. All of this seemed to be based round a fairly uncritical acceptance by the staff and parents of a 'core' set of values (discussed in the next section).

There was not much evidence of active debate about what was happening in the area of values education, either between school and parents or between staff within schools.

The research found that the majority of teachers and parents felt they shared a common view of the kinds of values they wished the pupils to develop. There were, of course, individuals who felt or were seen to be at odds with the general view. There were also a few schools where the staff felt that the circumstances of the community in which they found themselves meant that the values they were fostering in school did not mirror what was going on outside. Occasionally we encountered complaints that pupils have less grounding in this area when they arrive at school now than in the past. Nonetheless, teachers and parents across Scotland from whom we gathered information were generally speaking in accord over values education.

However, this shared view seems to be based largely on assumptions rather than explicit information. We uncovered little evidence that active debate is being focused on the implications of changes in society for the approach to values education in schools. In an age where external pressures on society's values are increasing, a willingness and ability to undertake a closer examination of the issues is likely to become increasingly necessary, both for the adults who are responsible for the development of tomorrow's society, and for the pupils who will be the members of that society.

The next theme takes as its focus the kinds of values staff are trying to foster in schools and the reasons why these values and values education are seen as important.

■ Staff perceptions of values

One of our research questions asked: 'What kinds of values do primary teachers see themselves as trying to teach their pupils?' A crucial first step in gaining an insight into teachers' understandings of values education was to find out what values they tried to promote. The values most often spoken of by staff in the case study schools were:

- consideration for others
- respect for others, and for property and authority
- religious values, a religious community
- a school community
- work
- pupil self-esteem
- self-discipline

The values most often listed by staff responding to the survey were:

- caring/concern for others
- honesty/integrity
- self-esteem
- good manners
- respect others
- consideration for others
- co-operate/be helpful

A characteristic of these terms as a whole is how broad they are. There could be considerable overlap between them, depending on individuals' own understandings. A recurring challenge of researching this area has been how to handle the associated language which is often vague and loosely defined, although subtle differences in the language can make critical differences to the message conveyed. For example, very early in the case-study stage of the research it was found that most teachers were not comfortable with the word 'teach' in connection with values, but were happier with the notion of 'fostering' values. Issues relating to such aspects of the language used for discussing values are addressed more fully later in this chapter.

We have found that a useful way of looking at the values identified as being fostered by teachers is to consider where each could be assigned under the five principles which the SCCC (1991) suggests should be embraced by values in education. These five principles are:

- an appreciation of learning
- respect and caring for self
- respect and caring for others
- a sense of belonging
- social responsibility.

An interesting observation is that none of the main values identified from the survey or the case studies fits easily under the description 'appreciation of learning'. This is not to say that no teachers or headteachers identified any values referring to learning. Small numbers of respondents to the survey identified such things as 'a positive attitude to learning', 'discovery and enjoyment in their education', 'achieving potential' and 'think critically'. Whilst 'work' was identified as a value in some of the case-study schools, it was the process of working as opposed to learning that seemed to be the focus in these cases. Teachers' current understanding of values education seems to place it separately from learning. We may unintentionally have reinforced this view for the survey respondents through the words and phrases we put on the cover of the questionnaire. We attempted to use an eclectic selection to encourage respondents to take a broad view of values education, but while 'group work' was included, there was no reference to learning. The cover words are included in the Technical Appendix.

Moving on to the other SCCC principles, 'self-esteem' and 'self-discipline' seem to fit well within 'respect and caring for self'. It is not easy to determine where any boundary comes between the principles of 'respect and caring for others' and 'social responsibility'. Both of these will contribute to the social cohesion of a group, and towards the remaining principle 'a sense of belonging', for the members of that group. The combination of these seemed to provide the main focus for the values teachers said they fostered.

The emphasis by teachers on promoting values with a socialising effect suggests a pragmatic element in the choice of values to be fostered, based largely on the need for social cohesion for successful classroom management in order to provide an effective learning environment. Perhaps this relates to the apparent perception of values education as separate from learning, with the values as almost a prerequisite for successful learning. To explore this further let us consider the findings relating to the research question: What rationales do [primary teachers] offer for teaching values and what do they see as its purpose?

In both phases of the research two main rationales for values education were being advanced by teachers. These were (a) the individual development and social cohesion of pupils, or minimising disruption to maximise learning, and (b) the fostering of 'values for life'. The individual development included under rationale (a) was sometimes related to aspects of learning, but often to becoming a more social being. Rationale (b) encompassed both specific aims towards preparing pupils for secondary school and further education, and also more general aims towards preparing pupils to take a full part in society. The different case study schools seemed to have a shared staff view which leaned towards one or other of these. In the survey responses (a) was more often given as the rationale for fostering specific values in the classroom, while (b) was more often given as a purpose for values education as a whole.

Teachers appear to work with a view of their pupils as a group rather than as individuals much of the time when considering values education. They might discuss the impact that 'difficult' pupils (ie those not conforming to the 'values' of the school or classroom) had on their approach to and success with fostering values, but the view conveyed most of the time is very much a collective one, their apparent aim to develop a socially cohesive group conforming to the teacher's or school's values. This interpretation is reinforced by the almost total absence of any reference to individual pupil's values or development.

However, from the case studies in particular we found some indications that teachers and heads have some doubts about the long-term effectiveness of their fostering of values. Pupils conform whilst at school but may not carry school's values into later life. This links with the view held by many that parents and home have greater influence on children's development of values than school. The next theme focuses on the ways in which values are currently fostered in Scottish primary schools.

■ Fostering values

Another of our research questions asked: How do teachers see themselves as fostering values? For example, through school discipline policy, through an explicit curriculum of personal and social education and religious and moral education and/or through subjects without an explicit values label? Most of the findings here are necessarily based on what teachers say they are doing, as relatively few of the teachers were directly observed.

The main way in which respondents say they demonstrate and foster values in school is by setting an example or acting as a role model. The role of the headteacher is widely acknowledged to be vital in determining the ethos of a school. The kinds of relationships between headteacher and other adults in school are likely to be reflected throughout the hierarchy, and many of the headteachers responding to our survey identified being a role model to all as a key role of theirs in the development of values education in their school.

Other frequently cited methods of demonstrating and fostering values include using praise and otherwise promoting the positive, and encouraging a happy atmosphere and good relationships between all in the school. Again, the desire for social cohesion appears to be a strong influence.

Policies and curricula were not so often identified as means through which to foster values than the less formal means discussed above. Nonetheless, while areas such as the playground and dinner hall were identified as the locus for values acquisition by some, the largest number of our respondents felt that most values education occurs in the classroom. This may be a matter of terminology, in that the values 'picked up' elsewhere around the school and beyond from peers and others may not be regarded by teachers as constituting part of values education.

However, turning to values education in the classroom, central questions in gaining an understanding of values education were: 'What kinds of teaching approaches are used in the context of values education and why? Are these the same as, or different from, other teaching approaches and why? In particular how do teachers deal with pupils' questioning or rejection of certain values?'

In the classroom, as in general, teachers indicate a preference for informal methods of transmitting values - showing by example, seizing the moment to reinforce a point and so on. Where they do use more formal approaches to values education, teachers feel these are generally the same as for any subject. There is relatively little use of planned discussion and debate of values related issues with the pupils, although there was some evidence from the case studies that some teachers may plan to the extent of engineering situations which provide a context for raising values issues. What debate there is seems to focus on why a particular value is important rather than on which values. The issue of values conflicts, especially between school and home, seems largely to be avoided.

As to whether the pupils 'learned' or not, our research questions asked: Are pupils aware of values education? Do they see a relevance to life outside school? The teachers and headteachers were generally confident that their pupils are aware of the values the school was promoting, even if they do not always try or succeed in holding to them. The pupils (those in the upper stages of the school at least) quite readily identified the 'values' their particular teachers had separately identified to the researchers. Like their teachers, the pupils gave mainly pragmatic rationales for these things being important. Since they were asked to focus on what their teachers said was important, it is not surprising that many of the rationales they gave were just a reflection of the rationales offered them by their teachers.

For many of the pupils from whom we collected evidence, what is important at school is also important at home. However, not all pupils feel that school values are relevant at home, their other main context at this age. Pupils tended to explain perceived differences between school and home by referring to the smaller number of people to be accommodated to at home, and the fact that you 'don't have to work at home'. Playground rules tended to be stated as prohibitions, important 'for your safety', and generally accepted by the pupils as important to them as individuals.

With regard to judging the success of their fostering of values, teachers tend to discuss this largely through referring to pupils' behaviour. From the case studies it appeared that this was largely an *ad hoc* collection of impressions, and there was little information available to the teacher from beyond the classroom. From this study as a whole there was little evidence of any systematic, planned monitoring of pupils' values or related behaviour. Our respondents indicated no particular dissatisfaction with the information available to them, but possibly because they are not aware of any other potential approaches to judging success.

Our final theme addresses some of the particular complexities of talking, thinking and researching about values and values education.

■ Complexities of researching values

A central issue in this study has been the lack of clear definition of much of the language in which it is discussed. The term 'values' itself is at the heart of this difficulty. Eminent writers urge caution in writing about values. Berkowitz (1995) argues that questions about values are 'not easily answered in a large part because of the sloppiness with which the

term values is used', and Popper (1976) claimed that '...few scientists and few philosophers with scientific training care to write about values. ... The reason is simply that so much of the talk about values is just hot air'.

The terminology can border on clichés, and some of the terms used by staff in our study were so broad that it was very difficult for us to be sure that we understood what they meant. This worked both ways, in that they did not always understand what we were asking. We are coming to the conclusion that it may be easier for people to make explicit their values if they are asked 'What do you value?', rather than 'What are values?'. The former question allows respondents to ground their answers firmly in their own experience and beliefs, whilst the latter seems to look for a more abstract reply. Whilst we attempted to encourage respondents to the survey questionnaire to ground their responses in the context of their own schools and most recent experience, it was essentially a decontextualised exercise. Values in 'real life' are inextricably bound up with the context in which they are addressed.

Not only are values in education contextualised by the school setting, but our study too was context-bound. The incidents observed and discussed in the case studies were only a very small flavour of the kind of incidents on which values education is based. They may have been very specific to the context of the school at that time, or on the other hand typify the kind of things that constantly recur. Teachers are continually selecting, consciously or otherwise, classroom incidents to focus on or ignore, or going beyond this to manipulate situations to provide the context for a point to be made or discussed. To some extent the discussions with the staff clarified these matters. The content of the discussions was, of course, in itself defined by the particular events observed.

Values are essentially subjective, developing within the individual as a result of life experiences and the social context in which that individual exists. We can reflect consciously on the resulting values, but it is more difficult to reflect on the processes involved in values formation. This raises two questions, one about the ability of teachers to reflect on the values component of their practice in 'mid flight' as it were, the other about the ability of researchers to investigate values without making explicit their own values which are brought to bear on perceptions, influencing what is seen and what is ignored. Researcher influences on findings of research have been recognised and explored in the literature, eg Rosenthal (1966), but the teachers' ability to reflect on values in relation to their practice has not received much attention, and might be worthy of further investigation.

Observing values education

The influence of the researchers on the evidence collected in this study was most clearly seen in the case studies. For example, in reflective interviews with teachers after periods of observation, they commented that they and the pupils in some cases had behaved differently, simply due to the researchers' presence. One could also argue that, when being observed, teachers and other individuals put on their 'best' performance. In this context this could be interpreted to suggest that teachers will have conveyed their most important values.

Observations alone are unlikely to lead to complete understanding of a situation. The perceptions and intentions of those observed will provide a fuller picture, and in this study these were probed through the reflective interviews. However, in an area as complex as values we found that the teachers were not always able to be explicit about the perceptions

and intentions at work in a given situation. An example might help to illustrate this. Here the researcher is not sure whether values come into the observed teacher's action and the code of the reflective interview is broken in an attempt to clarify the situation:

> *Researcher*: This is really leading you, but there is something that sticks out in my mind. There was a wee girl who was kneeling and you said. "Ladies sit on their bottoms. Ladies don't kneel with their bottoms in the air." Now you might construe that as something to do with values.
>
> *Teacher*: That little girl this morning was wearing jeans. That little girl has worn a very short skirt before and she comes from a rather poor family so underwear has sometimes not been adequate. So for her sake, she should not be kneeling. If you let her kneel at one time and not another time she doesn't know where she is. So, to put it kindly and politely for her sake, "Ladies don't kneel." Or, say it with others, maybe not such a poor child, "You can come and kneel across your desk when you see me doing it", and they'll all laugh as if to say, "You wouldn't do it", so I would ask, "Why are you doing it then?"

The teacher does not categorically confirm or deny the researcher's suggestion that values are at play here, and we are left wondering if the practitioner does see the situation as relevant to values education. The teachers' words could be taken as evidence that the teacher is sensitive to, or values, the child's background and tries to reconcile the child's view with her own values, or understanding of what is proper, but she does not say this is what she is doing. The researcher is left with the dilemma of who determines whether a given action is part of values education.

Writing about values

Such uncertainties could be discussed in the interviews, if not always resolved, but they were more of a challenge in the children's structured writing and in the survey questionnaire, because these situations did not allow two-way communication. In both of these contexts we encountered occasional disagreement with or lack of comment on particular items. These examples alerted us to the possibility that disagreement could paradoxically be positive. An example of this was the child who wrote that 'keeping things tidy' was not important to her, 'Because I do this already.' Such false negatives were discounted where evident, but their existence indicates that pupils' written evidence has to be approached with caution. Ambiguous phrasing and limited explanations can obscure a child's real meaning.

An unexpected finding from the survey, that teachers from independent schools identified 'self-esteem' as a value they fostered less often than did teachers from schools in the state sector, gave similar pause for thought. It might be that promoting pupils' self-esteem is so much a part of what they do that it is not explicit in these teachers' minds. If this were the case, might it not also be true that schools who have identified self-esteem as a value which they are consciously fostering are doing so in response to a current perception of low self-esteem among their pupils? And likewise for other values? Are the values listed in Table 6.1, for example, those which teachers believe are the most important that children should develop, or are they those which teachers spend most time on fostering because they are perceived as lacking in their pupils?

This is part of a whole issue of what might be the status of the data we collected, particularly from the survey. It tells us what teachers think they do, but to what extent is this what is actually happening in schools? Could it be more of an idealised view of what teachers and headteachers would like to see happening?

Concluding comments

By using a variety of techniques for gathering information in this study, the impact of the shortcomings of particular techniques was reduced. The approach used ensured that the findings of this study were grounded in the informants' views. Although a 'bottom-up' approach did not totally exclude the researchers' own views of values, it did lend an emphasis and authority to the respondents' views.

Behaviour, feelings and cognition were three aspects of values identified as part of our conceptual framework. As we have already said, behaviour seems to be so central to primary teachers' understanding of values that they actually list certain types of behaviour as 'values'. Whilst terms such as 'caring' and 'consideration' are open to different interpretations, they certainly convey a sense of engaging feelings as well as simply displaying appropriate behaviours.

The cognitive dimension of values seems rather less recognised or consciously addressed by teachers so far as we can determine. The teachers contributing to our research appeared to spend little time with their pupils considering the processes involved in reaching a personal values stance. There was little indication that this was considered as an explicit part of the staff's development of a school values stance either, though one could argue that every informal staff room conversation is value laden. The limited amount of explicit discussion of values education may in part be a consequence of the linguistic difficulties facing teachers if they attempt to address these issues. The difficulties posed to us as researchers by the shortcomings of the language available for discussing values education are also present for everyone working in this field.

The cognitive element could also be taken to mean specific subject content, and our framework encouraged us to look beyond the curricula for religious and moral education. Our findings indicated that whilst moral, and for some also religious, values might form the starting point for their understanding of the scope of values education, their thinking generally went beyond this. Even in the Catholic schools an overt religious approach was not the only or necessarily the main channel identified for the fostering of values. A purely moral stance was also rarely expressed, meaning the assertion that such and such is a value simply because it is 'right' or 'good'. Other subject areas, notably environmental issues such as conservation, were considered to be part of values education by some of our respondents. However, there did seem to be quite a narrow understanding of what was included, since the value of learning was so rarely mentioned, while learning must surely be something that teachers themselves do value. Again, perhaps this is a result of the lack of clarity of the terminology.

Our conceptual framework also raised the possibility that values might be expressed at fundamental and contextual levels. Regarding these as separable seems too simplistic. Our findings indicate a considerable degree of consensus over a core set of broad values fostered in primary schools across Scotland. Perhaps some might consider these to be 'fundamental' values in the 'context' of these schools.

Teachers do not on the whole have access to an established discourse to discuss values education, which may be why much of the language used is imprecise. When the language is imprecise it is hard to discuss and define a field, to make explicit what the concerns and issues are. Much of what is happening in values education in Scottish primary schools seems to be taken for granted and therefore not explicitly discussed, but this may no longer be enough in the context of changes in Scottish society together with the ever increasing ability to communicate world wide, which move us towards a more mixed community.

This study has taken a first step towards increasing understanding of what must be one of the most difficult areas of educational enquiry and we hope it will provide a springboard for further thinking about values education.

Bibliography

ALMOND, B. (1991) Seven moral myths. In: ROBB, W.M. (ed) *Values Education: some ways forward*. Aberdeen: Gordon Cook Foundation.

BALSON, M. (1992) *Understanding Classroom Behaviour*. 3rd (ed) Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

BARR, I.M. (ed)(1994) *A Sense of Belonging. Guidelines for values for the humanistic and international dimension of education Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe. (CIDREE) Volume 6. Dundee: Scottish Consultative Council on the* Curriculum (SCCC).

BARR, I.M. and HOOGHOFF, H.H.W. (eds) (1991) Values, *Schooling and Society* **2**. Enschede: Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE).

BECK, C. (1971) *Moral Education in the Schools: some practical suggestions.* Profiles in practical education 3. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

BECK, C., McCOY, N. and BRADLEY-CAMPBELL, J. (1980) *Reflections on Values: learning materials for grades 1-6.* Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Informal Series, 20.

BERKOWITZ, M.W. (1995) *Educating the Entire Moral Person.* Paper presented at conference Jornadas de Educacion en Valores y Desarollo moral, University of Barcelona (May 1995).

BERLIN, I. (1991) *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the history of ideas*. (Edited by Henry Hardy) London: Fontana Press.

BROWN, S. (1992) Getting the Most from Observing Teaching, *Spotlight* **32**, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE).

BROWN, S. and McINTYRE, D. (1989) *Making Sense of Teaching*. Edinburgh: SCRE.

CARR, D. (1991) Education and values, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **39**: 241-259.

COLE, M. (1991) Class values, political values and education for equality: a reply to Dr B.R. Singh, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, **21**: 81-83.

CRITTENDEN, B. (1978) Bearings in Moral Education: a critical review of recent work. *Australian Education Review* **12**. Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

CULLEN, M., MUNN, P., and JOHNSTONE, M.*Understanding Values in Primary Schools*, Working Paper 1 (unpublished)

GATHERER, W.A. (1991) Values. Teachers and Meanings, in *Values Education: Some ways forward*, edited by W.M. Robb, Gordon Cook Foundation, pp8-10.

GILLIGAN, C. (1982) *In a Different Voice: psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

GRIMMIT, M. (1991) The use of religious phenomena in schools: some theoretical and practical considerations, *British Journal of Religious Education*, **13**: 77-88.

HALMAN, L. (1991) The European values project: methodological issues in cross-national measures of values, *Joint Centre for Survey Methods Newsletter*, **11**: 7-11.

HARGREAVES, D.H. and HOPKINS, D. (1991) *The Empowered School: The management and practice of development planning.* (School Development Series) London: Cassell.

HARTLEY, D. (1985) Social education in Scotland: some sociological considerations, *Scottish Educational Review*, 17, 92-98.

HILL, B.V. (1991) Values in Education in Australian Schools. *Australian Educational Review* **32**. Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

HOLLIGAN, C. (1994) *Values in the Nursery: Case studies of practice.* Paisley: University of Paisley, Faculty of Education.

IRWIN, C.C. (1988) The assessment of values - some methodological considerations, *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, **25**: 289-298.

JACKSON, C., RODGER, A. and SQUIRES, J. (1992) *Moral Learning, Moral Development and Moral Education: a brief review of aspects of the field.* Dundee: Northern College.

JARRETT, J.L. (1991) *The Teaching of Values: Caring and appreciation.* London Routledge.

JOHNSON, D. (1990) *Parental Choice in Education.* London: Unwin Hyman.

JOHNSTONE, M. and MUNN, P. (1992) *Discipline in Scottish Secondary Schools: A survey.* Edinburgh: SCRE.

JOHNSTONE, M., MUNN, P. and EDWARDS, L. (1991) *Action Against Bullying: A support pack for schools.* Edinburgh: SCRE.

JONATHAN, R. (1989) Choice and control in education: parental rights, individual liberties and social justice, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **37**: 321-338.

JORDAN, B. (1991) Competencies and values, *Social Work Education*, **10**: 5-11.

KOHLBERG, L. (1981) *The Philosophy of Moral Development.* (Essays on Moral Development 1) London: Harper and Row.

LEWIS, A. (1992) Group Child Interviews as a Research Tool, *British Educational Research Journal*, **18**, 4: 413-421.

MARLAND, M. (1974) *Pastoral Care.* London: Heinemann Educational.

MUNN, P., JOHNSTONE, M. & CHALMERS, V. (1992) *Effective Discipline in Primary Schools and Classrooms.* London: Paul Chapman.

MUSGROVE, F. and TAYLOR, P.H. (1969) *Society and the Teacher's Role.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

NATIONAL CURRICULUM COUNCIL (1993) *Spiritual and Moral Development: a discussion paper.* York: NCC.

NISAN, M. (1988) The child as philosopher of values: Development of a distinct perception of values in childhood. *Journal of Moral Education*, **17**: 172-189.

NIXON, J. (1993) Review of David Galloway's "Pupil Welfare and Counselling: An approach to personal and social education across the curriculum." *Eduational Review*, Vol **45** no 2 p183.

NODDINGS, N. (1984) *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* University of California Press.

NORMAN, R. (1975) The neutral teacher? In: BROWN, S.C. *Philosophers Discuss Education.* London: Macmillan.

OSBORNE, R. (1980) Some aspects of the students' view of the world. *Research in Science Education*, **10**.

PIAGET, J. (1977 edition) *The Moral Judgement of the Child.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Educational.

POPPER, K.R. (1976) *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Bibliography.* London: Fontana/ Collins

POWNEY, J., GLISSOV, P., HALL, S. and HARLEN, W. (1995) *We Are Getting Them Ready for Life: Provision for pre fives in Scotland.* Edinburgh: SCRE.

PRING, R. (1984) *Personal and Social Education in the Curriculum.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

RATHS, L.E., HARMIN, M. and SIMON, S.B. (1978) *Values and Teaching: Working with values in the classroom.* 2nd ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merill.

REYNOLDS, D. and CUTTANCE, P. (1992) *School Effectiveness: Research, policy and practice.* (School Development Series) London: Cassell.

ROBB, W.M. (ed) (1991a) *Values Education: Some recent developments in Scotland.* (Report on workshop) Aberdeen: Gordon Cook Foundation.

ROBB, W.M. (ed) (1991b) *Values Education: Some ways forward.* (Report on workshop) Aberdeen: Gordon Cook Foundation.

ROBINSON, K. (1991) Values in Economics Education. *Economics*, **26**: 165-169.

RODGER, Alex (1992) *Position Paper: Towards a position on moral education in schools.* Dundee: Northern College.

ROSE, A.M. (1956) Sociology and the study of values. *British Journal of Sociology*, **7**: 1-17.

ROSENTHAL, R. (1966) *Experimenter Effects in Behavioural Research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

RUTTER, M., MAUGHAN, B., MORTIMORE, P. and OUSTON, J. (1979) *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary schools and their effect on children.* London: Open Books.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1991) *Values in Education: An SCCC paper for discussion and development*. Edinburgh: SCCC.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1992a) *Values in Education. Classroom Climate: A considered approach*. Edinburgh: SCCC.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1992b) *Values, Environmental Education and the School Curriculum: A seminar report*. Edinburgh: SCCC.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1992c) *Values in Education. An Evaluation*. Edinburgh: SCCC.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1992d) *Values in Education. Values and the Whole School - climate and culture*. Edinburgh: SCCC.

SCOTTISH CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL ON THE CURRICULUM (1993) *Gender Issues and Curriculum*. Dundee: SCCC.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1991a) *English Language 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1991b) *Mathematics 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1992a) *Expressive Arts 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1992b) *Religious and Moral Education 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1992c) *Using Performance Indicators in Primary School Self-Evaluation*. (School Development Planning Support Materials, HM Inspectors of Schools) Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1993a) *Environmental Studies 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCOTTISH OFFICE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1993b) *Personal and Social Development 5-14*. (Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland - National Guidelines). Edinburgh: SOED.

SCRIMGEOUR, R. and ARMSTRONG, A. (1993) News from schools. *Values Education Project Bulletin*, **3**.

SINGH, B. (1989) Reveiw of Mike Cole (ed) (1989) Education for Equality: some guidelines for good practice. London: Routledge. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, **20**: 339-341.

SINGH, B. (1991) Class values, political values and education for equality: A rejoinder to Mr M Cole. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, **21**: 245-247.

SQUIRES, J. (ed)(1993) *Principled Positions: Post modernism and the rediscovery of values*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

STRAUGHAN, R. (1989) *Beliefs, Behaviour and Education*. London: Cassell Educational.

SUTHERLAND, P. (1988) A longitudinal study of religious-moral values in late adolescence, *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol **14**, No 1.

TAYLOR, M.J. (1991a) Research and development on values education. In: William Robb (ed) *Values Education: some ways forward*. Aberdeen: Gordon Cook Foundation.

TAYLOR, M.J. (1991b) Response to starter paper. In: BARR, I.M. and HOOGHOFF, H.H.W. (eds) *Values, Schooling and Society*, 2. Enschede: Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE).

TAYLOR, M.J. (1994) *Values Education in the UK: A directory of research and resources*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research (with Gordon Cook Foundation).

TURIEL, E. (1983) *The Development of Social Knowledge: Morality and convention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1965 edition) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes*. London: Harvard University Press.

WAKEHAM, S.M. (1993) *Primary Teaching and the Negotiation of Power*. London: Paul Chapman.

WARNOCK, M. (1975) The neutral teacher. In: BROWN, S.C. (ed) *Philosophers Discuss Education*. London: Macmillan.

WATTS, M. and EBBUTT, D. (1987) More than the Sum of the Parts: Research methods in group interviewing. *British Educational Research Journal*, **13**, 1: 25-34.

WEST, S. (1993) *Educational Values for School Leadership*. London: Kogan Page.

WILSON, J. (1973) *The Assessment of Morality*. Windsor: NFER.

Appendix 1

The Advisory Committee provided consistently helpful and stimulating comments on the work and this report. Our thanks are owed to all the members and Professor Marvin Beckovitz also made constructive suggestions at the final stages.

Professor Bart McGettrick, Principal, St Andrew's College (Chair)
Mr Ian Barr, Director, Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum
Mr John Burdin, HMI (until November 1994)
Ms Wendy Dignan, Nursery Adviser, Lothian Region
Dr Bill Gatherer, The Gordon Cook Foundation
Ms Deirdre Hutton, Chairperson, Scottish Consumer Council
Professor Richard Pring, Director, Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford
Mr Bruce Wallace, Religious, Moral and Multicultural Advisor, Lothian Region
Professor Pamela Munn, Professor of Curriculum Studies, Moray House Institute (from October 1994)
Mrs Margaret Johnstone, Research Fellow, Moray House Institute (from October 1994)

Technical Appendix

Introduction

Two main approaches to data collection were employed in this study, in-depth studies of the practice of five schools, and a postal survey of teachers and headteachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools. The rationale for the chosen research approach is discussed briefly in Chapter 2, and a consideration of the impact of the methodology on the outcomes is presented as the final theme in Chapter 7. In this technical appendix we are aiming to give a full account of the methodology used in each of the two phases of the project.

Study school methods

Detailed investigations of teacher, parent and pupil views on values education were completed in five schools. In this research, we built on previous experience in an analogous area, that of trying to understand good discipline in classrooms and schools, which had used methods potentially fruitful in the area of values education. Different methods were used for obtaining information from different sources.

Staff

- semi-structured interviews with staff, focusing on values education in the classroom and in the school, using ideas developed from the philosophy of values. Target staff for this part of the research were the head, the assistant or depute head (if such a person were in post), one teacher from each stage in the school and any nursery nurse/teacher. Of the 38 interviewed, 4 were male, 3 of these being headteachers. We also interviewed 7 other staff (2 male) which included any ancillary staff in the school and any specialist teaching staff such as the learning support teacher
- reflective interviews with 13 teachers of P1, P4 and P7, focusing on any values education element(s), as identified by the teacher herself or himself in relation to a segment of teaching seen by one of the researchers. This approach places the identification, description and classification of values education firmly with the teacher.

Pupils

- group interviews with 62 pupils (28 girls, 34 boys) in 16 groups, focusing on their understanding of what the class teacher and the school deemed to be values education
- a structured writing task for all P5, P6 and P7 pupils, focusing on values education in school and at home. Overall, 268 pupils did this, 142 girls and 126 boys, with slightly more pupils from the 10-11 year age band than from others.

Parents

- telephone interviews with 21 parents, focusing on their understanding of school values/values education.

Other sources

- field notes, which are an important source of triangulation of ideas in the analysis. These focused on collecting evidence relating to a range of values, to cognitive, affective or volitional aspects of values, and to values conflict or existence of fundamental and/or contextual values
- scrutiny of school documents, again a source of triangulation. These documents included the forward plans of individual teachers and their assessments of class work.

The reflective interviews with teachers of P1, P4 and P7 formed a short series of 'thinking out loud' reflections, each recorded immediately after a segment of teaching observed by one of the researchers. This methodology uses ideas developed from the work of Brown and McIntyre (1989). We built on this method to include further work with these observed/reflective teachers, in order to discuss what we as observers noted as appearing to be values education, yet which they, as teachers did not volunteer in reflection.

Small groups of pupils from P1, P4 and P7 (classes whose teachers had given a series of reflective interviews) took part in the group interviews. Each group of pupils included one child whose parent was also interviewed. The pupils themselves were selected by the teachers as children who were friendly towards each other and included a mix of girls and boys.

The writing task and the group interviews both asked the pupils to focus primarily on what the class teacher said was important for the class. Both methods investigated the pupils' perceptions of what their teachers did to foster values, rather than what the pupils themselves saw as a value.

The writing task was presented in the form of two short booklets; these had been piloted and refined before use in the case study schools. One booklet concerned the classroom and the other the playground. In the first booklet, the children were asked to:

- write down one thing their teacher says is important for their class
- explain why their teacher says this thing is important
- decide if this thing is important at home or not and explain why
- decide if they feel this thing is important or not and explain why.

The second page asked for identical information about a second important thing. The playground booklet replicated the pattern but asked about two things which the grown-ups in the school say are important in the playground. The phrase, 'the grown-ups in the school', covered the headteacher the janitor, the class teacher, the playground supervisor et cetera. Teachers had advised that children would recognise the value being fostered, for example, respecting others, but would not recognise the term, 'value'. The piloting confirmed that the word 'important' elicited key 'values' ideas.

This method, of course, depended firstly on the children being able to write. For those who had difficulty with this, researchers acted as scribes and wrote down their spoken responses. We were also used as spell-checkers by many children. Although we had assured them that it was the content of what they said which was important some children were greatly concerned that their best work should be presented to us. Other children were more familiar with the idea of working on content first and presentation second. The method also depended upon the children's ability to put their thoughts on to paper in a clear

way, and on the children's honesty in their replies. In respect of clarity of response, in each of the schools save School A, there was a small percentage of replies (from about 1% to 7%) which was unclear. It is possible that other replies which appeared to be clear were in fact not fully representative of the pupils' thinking. This is always the case with a written response, from either children or adults, if the response cannot be discussed. However, the group interviews, where the pupils clarified their ideas about what the teacher said was important, provided some validation for the ideas emerging from the structured writing. This, plus the ability of the children to disagree with what the teacher said, seemed to indicate that the pupils had not given a placatory response.

Group interviews provided a consensus view from children. As others have argued (Lewis, 1992; Watts and Ebbutt, 1987), group interviews are particularly useful if the researcher intends to elicit information about group norms and beliefs, about the collective views. Mixed groups of boys and girls reflected the composition of the classes and the normal working groups within the classes. As with the writing task, the discussions focused on the values which each group's class teacher had said she was trying to foster in that class. A schedule for a phased interview drew on the Interview-about-Events technique discussed by Osborne (1980). Table A.1 shows the phases of our schedule.

Table A.1: *Phases of the pupil group interviews*

Phase 1	gaining the group meaning for the teacher-identified value
Phase 2	gaining the group's view of whether and why this value was important in their class
Phase 3	gaining views on its importance away from school
Phase 4	gaining insight into how the children themselves felt about the value

Using the schedule, we asked the children questions which allowed them to transmit their knowledge, to focus on their shared experience of their classroom, to explore meanings and intentions, and share their home experiences also.

The discussions took place near the end of the case study field work in the schools. Researchers were therefore fairly familiar faces to the children. This familiarity almost certainly helped to establish a rapport between the children and the interviewer. The interviews were taped and took place in private away from the classroom. The interviewer assured the children that what they said would not be reported to anyone in a form which would identify them. In one case we breached this promise and told the class teacher that a child had disclosed that he was being hurt at home. Gaining data from children in confidence, particularly about an area like values which lies at the heart of all social interaction, always carries the risk of such disclosure and interviewers have to decide their ethical stance on this.

To collect this data we spent a day or two days a week in each of the schools, spread out over a period of two to three months. Basically, each school had from eight full days (the smallest, two teacher school) to twenty full days of researcher time. The schools themselves are described in the next section.

Five primary schools

The five study schools were chosen on grounds of size. In three Scottish regions within accessible travelling distance, the primary schools were grouped by us into size bands incrementing by 50. Within each region, there was a modal size band where the highest

number of primary schools was found. Schools were then chosen from these bands at random, save that one denominational school (also selected at random) was included. Table A.2 gives the general picture.

Table A.2: *The study schools*

	N pupils	N teachers	Nursery?	Location
School A	30	2		Rural/dormitory
School B	123	7	✓	Rural
School RC	275	13		New town but RC school, broad catchment
School D	203	9	✓	Mining village in economic decline
School E	450	17	✓	Urban school, socially mixed catchment

This summative description might usefully be expanded by a brief characterisation of each school, to give an idea of their specific histories and contexts.

School A

The smallest of the schools, School A had two classrooms and a hall for dinners and for physical education. The headteacher had the senior class (P5, P6 and P7) and in addition to administrative duties had to check the boiler, deal with repairs to the fabric of the school and keep the building in running order. For one half-day in the week, another teacher took the class to let the headteacher catch up with paperwork. Both teachers in this school felt they knew the parents; there were a few farm families with children at the school, but the proximity of School A's village to a larger town meant that more of the families were commuters. Children from School A went on to the high school in town, save for a minority who went on to fee-paying schools. The teachers felt happy about their pupils' dedication to work, but tended to worry about the future transition for the children from the 'family atmosphere' to the impersonal and busy secondary school.

School B

School B was also a rural school, in a larger village than School A. The two storey school did not have enough classrooms, and the two infant classes were accommodated in a rather small portable classroom in the playground. The nursery too was in a separate building very close by. The school roll was just high enough to allow the head to be non-teaching, which she felt greatly benefited the development of the school. The head did in fact teach regularly, taking different classes at different times, in order to get to know the pupils and to share in the teachers' concerns; the head had been in the school for three years. Like School A, School B too had parents whose work was in a nearby town, although there were also children whose grandparents had attended the school. The teachers in the school felt they knew most of the parents of the children in their classes, and hoped that parents would not hesitate to contact them or visit the school. In School B, the staff felt pleased with the pupils' work and in addition devoted effort to promoting a happy school. Harmony in the school and in the playground was important to the staff at School B, and pupil happiness was important too.

School RC

School RC was a Roman Catholic school situated in a new town, a sprawl of houses and attractively laid-out pedestrian paths which were on dark mornings or afternoons seen by staff as threatening places for young children to walk. The fact that some parents chose the school rather than a closer school, despite having to convey the children there or use the school bus, was seen as indicative of support for the education offered in a Roman Catholic primary school. The school itself was generously provided with space, in semi-open plan style. One criticism made by staff was that the shape of the school polarised the infant classes at one end and older classes at the other, with the staffroom, dining hall and school offices forming a barrier between the two areas. At each end of the school, classrooms fed off a central working area for painting, computer work or projects which needed space.

School RC had within the past few years taken in pupils and staff from another Roman Catholic school in the town. This was mentioned by many (but not all) of the staff as contributing to an awareness of what the school policies were and to discussion of what direction to move in. Senior staff in the school had taught in the school for many years; the headteacher, although some distance from retiral age, had taught the parents of some of his pupils. Interestingly, although staff felt that they knew the parents, and that there were strong links with the parish, the headteacher found it hard to judge overall what percentage of pupils were from Catholic families. Staff in School RC had two concerns for their pupils: to prepare them for secondary school and to prepare them to enter the religious community. Balancing these two concerns was not always straightforward, but the management team in the school had involved all staff in an assessment of school policy and in discussions about the best way forward for the school.

School D

School D was located in an area of high unemployment, with traditional industry in decline. The building itself was an old one, and the layout caused difficulties, in that allowing parents free access (in the infant department) implied a certain lack of security. The school benefited from the Region's positive discrimination budget and the staffing level was good. However, the school had to compete against a nearby school seen as more attractive to parents with aspirations.

The headteacher in School D had fairly recently taken up his post; he had been in the school for just over two years. There was unresolved tension amongst staff in the school as to the best relationships between the school and the community. Different people in the school expressed different ideas about the pupils, their parents and the overall aims of the school. Within this confusion and change, staff agreed that their pupils (or possibly a minority of their pupils) were deficit in social skills and behaved in ways that made it difficult to maintain a positive classroom atmosphere. For staff at School D, the way forward was not clear.

School E

School E, the largest of the schools, was sited in a small town which had in effect been swallowed up as part of a larger town. The school was Victorian and suffered from a difficult layout, inadequate classrooms and a deteriorating fabric. Nevertheless, every effort had been made to keep it bright and cheerful. The management team here were all experienced and the head had been in the school for twenty years. The head was a committed Christian, taking school services with enthusiasm. However, parents were

seen by staff as very varied in their outlook on life and in what they expected from school. The school had a socially-mixed catchment, from 'professional people' to 'old local families' to 'incomers' to 'kind of hippy types'. Several members of staff noted that pupils from School E were praised by staff at the secondary school for their cheerful ability to fit in with others, which they attributed to the 'good social mix' at the school. This varied catchment may also have contributed to management efforts to clarify school policy and to come up with an acceptable action plan. Discussions on this were taking place as we visited the school, focusing on the idea of good discipline. Getting on well together, as well as getting on with work was important at School E.

Survey methods

The survey phase of the project was designed to follow on from, and expand on, the information gathered during the case studies. Questionnaires based on themes arising from the case studies were sent to headteachers and teachers in a sample of Scottish primary schools.

The questionnaire

Two versions of the questionnaire were required, one for teachers and one for headteachers. These two were identical in part, but the teacher version included some additional questions on recent practice in the classroom, and the headteacher version some questions on management issues.

The construction of the questionnaires went through a process of refinement. The starting point was the research questions and broad strands from the case-study data. From these we identified ideas amenable to being addressed through a questionnaire.

The initial draft questionnaire was fairly prescriptive, using check-off lists and rating scales for degree of agreement with various statements. The statements were derived from the views and comments of the case-study teachers. This format was piloted in a small number of schools.

The pattern of responses obtained, combined with further consideration of the kind of information being sought from the survey, led to the questionnaire being redrafted with a much more open structure. In this way we were able to tap into the areas highlighted by the case-study data, but allow more scope for the respondents to express their own perceptions of what values education is. Piloting of this second version of the questionnaires indicated that this would be a useful approach. In particular it would allow us to draw stronger conclusions about the existence of consensus on various issues than would a more prescriptive approach.

Experience from the case study phase of the project had indicated that "values education" was not itself a familiar term to many teachers. They sought confirmation of their interpretation of it from the researchers interviewing them. In the survey, as in the case studies, our aim was to learn what teachers understood by values education. However, in order to reduce the likelihood that people would not fill in the questionnaire because they weren't sure what we were asking about, we provided a background preamble attempting to convey this. We supported this by printing a selection of "values words" on the cover of the questionnaire. These were chosen to try to encourage the respondents to take as broad a view of values as they wished. Inevitably there is a risk that cues such as these may have limited or directed people's responses more than we would have wished. The cover words and preamble, the same for the teacher and headteacher

questionnaires, are reproduced at the end of this appendix. Copies of the two questionnaires used in this research are available from SCRE on request.

The sample

In identifying state schools, we were conscious of the relative merits of drawing up a stratified, as opposed to random, sample. The main concern was to test themes arising from the case studies in schools of different size and religious orientation.

Given the preponderance of non-denominational state schools in Scotland, we predicted that a random sample could have provided insufficient numbers of Catholic schools to make comparison meaningful. Our 10% sample, therefore, included 10% of Catholic schools as well as non-denominational schools.

Our sample was also stratified by size. This was done by creating small, medium and large bands according to the school roll. Schools with a roll of 240 pupils or fewer were classed as small. The medium band covered schools with a roll between 241 and 460 pupils. The large schools were those with a roll of more than 460 pupils.

Ten percent each of schools from the small and medium size bands were included. Fifty percent of schools from the large size band were included, because of the relatively small numbers of state primaries of this size in Scotland. This again was to enable us to collect data from enough schools to allow us to draw meaningful comparisons.

Table A.3 shows the state sector sample break down by size and denomination.

Table A.3: *State primaries in Scotland and study sample by size and denomination*

	State Primaries in Scotland			Study Sample		
	RC	Non-denom	Total	RC	Non-denom	Total
Small	214	1336	1550	19	134	153
Medium	136	587	723	14	59	73
Large	5	69	74	2	33	35
Total	355	1992	2347	35	226	261

The sample was drawn across all Scottish regions. In order to meet the criteria for size and denomination, regional samples varied from 8.3% to 13%. A particular influence on this variation was our requirement to include 10% of the Catholic primary schools. Due to the uneven spread of these schools across Scotland, our sample of Catholic schools came almost exclusively from the central belt, and largely from Strathclyde at that. The number of sample schools from each region is shown in brackets beside the number of returns in Table A.5

No independent schools were included among the case studies, so it was felt that their inclusion in the survey would provide useful additional information for comparison. Forty-eight independent schools were included in the sample. These were all the independent schools in Scotland which have primary classes except specialist schools.

Each school in the sample was sent questionnaires for the headteacher and for one teacher each of P1, P4 and P7 classes. In smaller schools there was only an expected return of one or two questionnaires from teachers of composite groups, whereas in larger schools a return of four questionnaires was possible. Teachers of P1, P4 and P7 were targeted, in line with those selected to participate in the reflective interviews in the case study schools.

to provide a cross-sectional view and an opportunity to investigate any differences in approach to values education as pupils develop through the primary age range. In this survey we did not sample the views of visiting staff, ancillary staff, parents or pupils.

Questionnaires were thus sent to the headteachers and up to three teachers in each of 309 Scottish primary schools. Headteachers were asked to distribute questionnaires to the target class teachers. Individual reply envelopes were provided for all respondents. The survey took place in November 1994.

The response

By our original deadline for return of completed questionnaires, the overall response rate stood at about 30%, slightly lower for independent schools. Reminder letters were then sent to those schools from which a full complement of questionnaires had not been received. The final overall response rate, calculated on the basis of the number of schools from which we had received at least one questionnaire, headteacher or teacher version, was 43%. Table A.4 shows the number of schools responding by size and denomination.

Table A.4: *Study sample and schools responding by size and denomination*

	Study Sample			Number of schools responding			
	RC	Non-denom	Total	RC	Non-denom	Total	% return
Small	19	134	153	9	61	70	46
Medium	14	59	73	4	24	28	38
Large	2	33	35	0	14	14	40
State total	35	226	261	13	99	112	43
Independent			48			20	42
TOTAL			309			132	43

We had a slightly lower response rate from Catholic schools (35%) than non-denominational schools (44%). Twenty of the 48 independent schools included in our sample responded, a return of 42% very much in line with the 43% return from state schools overall. There were some slight regional variations in the response rate, with both schools in the Orkney sample responding (ie 100%) and only 5 of the 19 schools in Ayr participating (26%). This latter may have been strongly affected by the number of single teacher schools in Ayr. Otherwise the returns fell mostly in the range 30-50%. Table A.5 shows the spread of returned questionnaires across all Scottish regions.

Table A.5: *Regional spread of survey returns (number in sample shown in brackets)*

	Total Schools in Scotland			Number of schools responding			
	RC	Non-denom	Total	RC	Non-denom	Total	% return
Highland	3	197	200	0 (0)	9 (21)	9 (21)	43
Grampian	6	268	274	0 (0)	18 (30)	18 (30)	60
Tayside	19	169	188	0 (2)	9 (20)	9 (22)	41
Fife	14	131	145	1 (1)	4 (16)	5 (17)	31
Lothian	42	198	240	2 (3)	10 (29)	12 (32)	38
Borders	4	72	76	0 (0)	3 (7)	3 (7)	43
Central	11	105	116	0 (2)	5 (12)	5 (14)	39
Dumfries & Galloway	8	108	116	0 (0)	6 (12)	6 (12)	50
Orkney	0	24	24	0 (0)	2 (2)	2 (2)	100
Shetland	0	35	35	0 (0)	1 (3)	1 (3)	33
Western Isles	0	45	45	0 (0)	2 (5)	2 (5)	40
Strathclyde							
Argyll & Bute	4	73	77	0 (0)	4 (8)	4 (8)	50
Ayr	27	123	150	0 (1)	5 (18)	5 (19)	26
Dumbarton	33	84	117	3 (5)	4 (7)	7 (12)	58
Glasgow	86	143	229	5 (8)	3 (16)	8 (24)	33
Lanark	62	146	208	0 (6)	8 (14)	8 (20)	40
Renfrew	36	71	107	2 (7)	6 (8)	8 (15)	53
State Total	355	1992	2347	13 (35)	99 (226)	112 (263)	43
Independent			48			20	42
TOTAL			309			132	43

In terms of numbers of questionnaires, we received 119 completed headteacher questionnaires (a 38.5% return), and 191 completed teacher questionnaires (roughly a 25% return - given that we did not always know quite how many questionnaires to expect from the smaller schools). Among these were a few instances where we received a questionnaire from the headteacher but no teachers (including 5 where the headteacher was the only teacher), and also a few instances where we received questionnaires from one or more teachers but not from the headteacher. By and large, however, the schools which participated did so as a body, returning the headteacher questionnaire and a number of teacher questionnaires appropriate to the size of the school. Responses were received from teachers and headteachers in Catholic, non-denominational and independent schools in varying proportions, as shown in Table A.6.

Table A.6: *Numbers of questionnaires returned*

	Catholic	Non-denominational	Independent
Teacher questionnaire	13	143	35
Headteacher questionnaire	11	89	19
Total questionnaires	24	232	54
Percentage return	8	75	17

The somewhat disappointing return was undoubtedly influenced by the prominence of teacher workload as an issue in schools at this time. We were contacted by 14 schools to say they were unable to participate in the survey for this reason. However, it may also have been the case that unfamiliarity with values education as a matter for explicit discussion deterred people from responding. Many of those who did respond were clearly strongly committed to values education (under whatever label) as a key issue in primary education, as the following comments indicate.

> I am delighted that this survey is taking place. Hopefully it will highlight the strenuous efforts being made by teachers to encourage and promote values.

> I'm glad that someone has "homed in" on values in education. As I said, I consider them to be fundamental.

Our uncertainty over whether it was the workload issue, the subject matter of the survey, or some other reason which led to the low response rate to our survey means we have to exercise some caution in any assumptions we make about the typicality of the views of our respondents. However, because of the large numbers of teachers who did not respond, it seems reasonable to suppose that those who did make time to do so have a particular interest in values education. They may have spent some time considering and debating the issues. Viewed in this light, the understandings, language and practical approaches identified by these teachers may therefore have a lot to offer to other schools and teachers who have not so far tried or succeeded in addressing these issues.

This said, the proportions of participating schools with rolls falling into various bands are broadly in line with those in Scotland as a whole. Also, on a number of general measures such as gender and age, the individuals who responded to our survey are representative of the population of Scottish primary teachers as a whole. Thus, whilst rather small, our sample does not appear to be atypical of the range in general terms.

Characteristics of the survey respondents

The proportion of all primary schools in Scotland with a roll of fewer than 20 pupils (as at September 1993, reported in the Scottish Office Statistical Bulletin, March 1994) was 6.5%. Of the schools from which we got a response to our survey, 5.2% had fewer than 20 pupils. In Scotland as a whole 7.9% of primary schools have a roll of more than 400 pupils (source as above), while 11.7% of schools participating in our survey had rolls of this size. Thus the schools in the survey include a similar proportionate spread of sizes as is found in Scottish primary schools overall.

Tables A.7, A.8 and A.9 show how the individual respondents to our survey compare to the population of Scottish primary teachers as a whole on a number of general measures. The figures for Scotland as a whole were obtained from the Scottish Office Statistical Bulletin dated June 1992.

Table A.7: *Teacher and HT numbers by gender*

	Headteachers		Teachers	
	Scotland	**Survey**	**Scotland**	**Survey**
Female	31%	29%	8%	6%

Table A.8: *Number of headteachers by age-band*

	Scotland	Survey
<25	0%	0%
25-34	4%	2%
35-49	58%	63%
over 50	38%	35%

Table A.9: *Number of teachers by age-band*

	Scotland	Survey
<25	2%	5%
25-34	20%	18%
35-49	53%	55%
over 50	20%	22%

The analysis

The completed questionnaires were coded and the data entered on to computer for analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). To assist the coding of the open responses, pre-coded lists of options were prepared from a combination of the views of case-study teachers and the responses given in the trailing stage of the questionnaire development.

The coding schemes were developed in such a way as to maintain as much as possible of the detail of the responses whilst not coding every separate nuance individually. This was achieved by using broad themes derived from the case study findings, and developing sub groupings within these. These were extended as necessary during the process of coding.

The largest part of the analysis concentrated on calculating descriptive statistics to characterise the responses being given to the various questions. Because of the low response rate we were limited in the amount of more in-depth analysis we could apply to the data.

Under the questionnaire section 'Values at Whole School Level', teachers and headteachers were all asked to respond to the following:

> Whether or not you feel there is a shared values stance in your school, you are probably able to identify certain values that are emphasised by yourself and other staff. Please list the values that are stressed within your school.

While there was a relatively small group of 'values' identified by a substantial number of our respondents, overall there was a very broad range of things identified, some by only a handful of respondents. Table A.10 lists all the responses given, showing the number (and percentage) of respondents identifying each.

Table A.10: *List of all values identified as being stressed within schools, with numbers of teachers and headteachers identifying each*

Value	No. (%) identifying (N=293)
caring/concern (esp. for younger pupils)/for people less fortunate	106 (36%)
honesty / integrity	102 (35%)
self-esteem/self respect/self confidence/self worth/self awareness	101 (35%)
good manners	95 (32%)
respect others	95
consideration for/thinking of others	90 (31%)
co-operate/be helpful	88 (30%)
independence	46 (16%)
conservation/caring for the environment / tidy playground	43 (15%)
sharing/turn-taking	38 (13%)
consideration for property (often specified as school property)	36 (12%)
responsibility	35 (12%)
tolerance	35
creating a "family atmosphere"/secure environment	35
rules (appreciate need for)/Code of Conduct	34 (12%)
fairness/equal opportunities	32 (11%)
happiness	30 (10%)
friendship	30
good behaviour	29 (10%)
value of education/learning - positive attitude to - high standards	28 (10%)
politeness	28
kindness/generosity	25 (9%)
being positive - "smile"	22 (8%)
self-discipline (self control)	20 (7%)
hard working/application/motivation	19 (7%)
respect differences (viewpoints) in others/rights of individual	19
responsibility to others in the community/contributing/reliability	19
courteous (prepared to listen, everyone's opinion is important)	18 (6%)
work together/group responsibility	18
good home-school links/relationships	17 (6%)
multi-culturalism	15 (5%)
trying to do your best/proper ambition	14 (5%)
achieving potential/success	13 (4%)
loyalty/commitment/pride in selves and school	13
no bullying	12 (4%)

Values	No. (%) identifying (N=293)
sympathetic/understanding	11 (4%)
individualism/all special, different talents and abilities	10 (3%)
truth	10
aware of others' shortcomings	10
health/healthy eating/drugwise	8 (3%)
religious values	8
independent working/initiative	7 (2%)
safety (roads, fire drills, of selves and others)	7
trust	7
personal development/increase listening skills	6 (2%)
conform/obedience	6
community spirit	5 (2%)
communication	5
staff personal development	5
good citizenship	4 (1%)
discovery and enjoyment in their education/variety/interest	3 (1%)
gratefulness/appreciation/saying thank you	3
social values (no slang, no swearing)	3
right from wrong	3
rights of children	3
non-violence	3
think critically	2 (<1%)
school as a community	2
uniform!?	2
social cohesion	2
no stealing	2
broadening experience/awareness of wider world	2
conflict resolution	1 (<1%)
life is not always fair	1
feelings	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE